

A SECOND
VINDICATION
OF THE
Reasonableness
OF
Christianity, &c.

By the Author of the *Reasonableness*
of Christianity, &c.

L O N D O N,

Printed for A. and J. Churchill, at the Black
Swan in Pater-Noster-Row, 1697.

66/2391



PREFACE

TO THE

READER.

I*T hath pleased Mr. Edwards, in Answer to the Reasonableness of Christianity, &c. and its Vindication, to turn one of the most weighty and important Points that can come into Question (Even no less than the very Fundamentals of the Christian Religion) into a meer Quarrel against the Author; as every one, with Mr. Bold, may observe. In my Reply to him, I have*

Preface to the Reader.

endeavour'd, as much as his Objections would allow me, to bring him to the Subject matter of my Book, and the merits of the Cause; Though his peculiar way of writing Controversie has made it necessary for me in following him step by step, to wipe off the Dirt he has thrown on me, and clear my self from those Falshoods he has filled his Book with. This I could not but do, in dealing with such an Antagonist; that by the Untruths I have proved upon him, the Reader may judge of those other Allegations of his, whereof the Proof lying on his side, the bare Denial is enough on mine, and indeed, are wholly nothing to the Truth or Falshood of what is contain'd in my Reasonableness of Christianity, &c. To which I shall desire the Reader to add this further Consideration
from

Preface to the Reader.

from his way of Writing, not against my Book, but against me for writing it, That if he had had a Real concern for Truth and Religion in this Dispute, he would have treated it after another manner ; And we should have had from him more Argument, Reasoning and Clearness, and less Boasting, Declamation and Railing. It has been unavoidable for me to take notice of a great deal of this sort of Stuff, in answering a Writer who has very little else to say in the Controversie, and places his strength in things besides the Question : But yet I have been so careful to take all Occasions to explain the Doctrine of my Book, that I hope the Reader will not think his Pains wholly lost labour in perusing this Reply, wherein he will find some further, and I hope satisfying, Account concer-

Preface to the Reader.

ning the Writings of the New Testament, and the Christian Religion contained in it.

Mr. Edward's ill Language, which I thought personally to me (though I knew not how I had Provoked a Man whom I had never had to do with) I am now satisfied by his Rude and Scurrilous treating of Mr. Bold, is his Way and Strength in Management of Controversie; And therefore requires a little more Consideration in this Disputant than otherwise it would deserve. Mr. Bold, with the Calmness of a Christian, the Gravity of a Divine, the Clearness of a Man of Parts, and the Civility of a well bred Man, made some Animadversions on his Socinianism Unmask'd; Which with a Sermon Preach'd on the same Subject with my Reasonableness of Christianity,
he

Preface to the Reader.

be Published : And how he has been used by Mr. Edwards, let the World judge.

I was extreamly surprized with Mr. Bold's Book, at a time when there was so great an Outcry against mine on all hands. But it seems he is a Man that does not take up things upon Hearsay ; nor is afraid to own Truth, whatever Clamor or Calumny it may lie under. Mr. Edwards confidently tells the World, that Mr. Bold has been drawn in to espouse this Cause, upon base and mean Considerations. Whose Picture of the two, such a Description is most likely to give us, I shall leave to the Reader to judge, from what he will find in their Writings on this Subject. For as to the Persons themselves, I am equally a Stranger to them both : I know not the Face of either of them : And having

Preface to the Reader.

hitherto never had any Communication with Mr. Bold, I shall begin with him, as I did with Mr. Edwards in Print; and here publickly return him this following Acknowledgment for what he has Printed in this Controversie.

To Mr. Bold.

S I R,

THough I do not think I ought to return Thanks to any one for being of my Opinion, any more than to fall out with him for differing from me; Yet I cannot but own to all the World the Esteem that I think is due to you, for that Proof you have given of a Mind and Temper becoming a true Minister of the Gospel, in appearing as you have

Preface to the Reader.

have done, in the Defence of a point, a great point of Christianity, which it is evident you could have no other temptation to de-
declare for, but the love of Truth. It has fared with you herein no better than with me. For Mr. *Edwards*, not being able to Answer your Arguments, has found out already that you are a *Mercenary*, defending a Cause against your *Perswasion* for hire; and that you are sailing to *Racovia* by a side Wind: Such Inconsistencies can one (whose Business it is to Rail for a Cause he cannot defend) put together to make a noise with: And he tells you plainly what you must expect, if you write any more on this Argument, *viz.* to be pronounced a downright *Apostate* and *Renegado*.

As

Preface to the Reader.

As soon as I saw your *Sermon* and *Animadversions*, I wonder'd what Scare-Crow Mr. *Edwards* would set up, wherewith he might hope to deterr Men of more Caution than Sense from reading of them : Since *Socinianism*, from which you were known to be as remote as he, I concluded would not do. The unknown Author of the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, he might make a *Socinian*, *Mahometan*, *Atheist*, or what sort of *Raw-head* and *Bloody-bones* he pleased. But I imagined he had had more sence than to venture any such Aspersions on a Man whom, though I have not yet the Happiness personally to know ; yet I know hath justly a great and settled Reputation amongst worthy Men : And I thought that that Coat which you
had

Preface to the Reader.

had worn with so much Reputation, might have preserved you from the bespatterings of Mr. *Edward's* Dunghil. But what is to be expected from a Warriour that hath no other Ammunition, and yet ascribes to himself Victory from hence, and with this Artillery imagines he carries all before him? And so *Skimmington* Rides in Triumph, driving all before him by the Ordures that he bestows on those that come in his way. And were not Christianity concerned in the case, a Man could scarce excuse to himself the Ridiculousness of entering into the List with such a Combatant. I do not therefore wonder that this mighty Boaster, having no other way to Answer the Books of his Opponents, but by popular Calumnies, is fain to have recourse

Preface to the Reader.

course to his only Refuge, and lay out his natural Talent in Vilifying and Slandering the Authors. But I see, by what you have already writ, how much you are above that; and as you take not up your Opinions from Fashion or Interest, so you quit them not to avoid the malicious Reports of those that do: Out of which number, they can hardly be left, who (unprovoked) mix with the management of their Cause, Injuries and ill Language to those they differ from. This, at least I am sure, Zeal or Love for Truth, can never permit Falshood to be used in the Defence of it.

Your Mind I see prepar'd for Truth, by resignation of it self not to the Traditions of Men, but the Doctrine of the Gospel,
has

Preface to the Reader.

has made you more readily entertain, and more easily enter into the meaning of my Book, than most I have heard speak of it. And since you seem to me to comprehend, what I have laid together, with the same Disposition of Mind, and in the same Sence that I received it, from the Holy Scriptures, I shall as a mark of my respect to you, give you a particular Account of the Occasion of it.

The Beginning of the Year in which it was Published, the Controversie that made so much noise and heat amongst some of the Dissenters, coming one Day accidentally into my Mind, drew me by degrees into a stricter and more thorough Enquiry into the Question about Justification. The Scripture was direct and plain, that

Preface to the Reader.

that 'twas Faith that justified,
The next Question then, was what
Faith that was that justified;
What it was which, if a Man
believed, it should be imputed to
him for Righteousness. To find
out this, I thought the right way
was to Search the Scriptures;
and thereupon betook my self
seriously to the Reading of the
New Testament, only to that Pur-
pose. What that produced, you
and the World have seen.

The first View I had of it seem'd
mightily to satisfy my mind, in
the Reasonableness and Plainness
of this Doctrine; But yet the ge-
neral Silence I had in my little
Reading met with, concerning
any such thing, awed me with
the Apprehension of Singularity;
Till going on in the Gospel Hi-
story, the whole tenour of it
made

Preface to the Reader.

made it so clear and visible, that I more wonder'd that every body did not see and imbrace it; than that I should assent to what was so plainly laid down, and so frequently inculcated in Holy Writ, though Systems of Divinity said nothing of it. That which added to my Satisfaction, was, that it led me into a Discovery of the marvellous and divine Wisdom of our Saviour's Conduct, in all the Circumstances of his promulgating this Doctrine; as well as of the necessity that such a Law-giver should be sent from God for the reforming the Morality of the World; Two Points that I must confess, I had not found so fully and advantageously explain'd in the Books of Divinity I had met with, as the History of the Gospel

Preface to the Reader.

spel seem'd to me, upon an attentive Perusal, to give Occasion and Matter for. But the Necessity and Wisdom of our Saviour's opening the Doctrine (which he came to publish) as he did in Parables and figurative ways of speaking, carries such a Thread of Evidence through the whole History of the Evangelists, as I think is impossible to be resisted; and makes it a Demonstration, that the Sacred Historians did not write by concert as Advocates, for a bad Cause, or to give Colour and Credit to an Imposture they would Usher into the World; Since they, every one of them, in some place or other, omit some Passages of our Saviour's Life, or Circumstances of his Actions; which shew the Wisdom

Preface to the Reader:

dom and Wariness of his Conduct ; and which even those of the Evangelists, who have recorded , do barely and transiently mention, without laying any Stress on them, or making the least remark of what Consequence they are to give us our Saviour's true Character, and to prove the Truth of their History. These are Evidences of Truth and Sincerity, which result alone from the Nature of things, and cannot be produced by any Art or Contrivance.

How much I was pleased with the growing Discovery, every Day, whilst I was employed in this search, I need not say. The wonderful Harmony, that the farther I went, disclosed it self, tending to the same Points, in all the parts of the sacred History of the Gospel, was of no small Weight with me

a

and

Preface to the Reader.

and another Person, who every Day, from the beginning to the end of my search, saw the Progress of it, and knew at my first setting out, that I was ignorant whither it would lead me; and therefore, every Day, asked me what more the Scripture had taught me. So far was I from the thoughts of *Socinianism*, or an Intention to write for that or any other Party, or to publish any thing at all. But when I had gone through the whole, and saw what a plain, simple, reasonable thing Christianity was, suited to all Conditions and Capacities; and in the Morality of it now, with divine Authority, established into a legible Law, so far surpassing all that Philosophy and humane Reason had attain'd to, or could possibly make effectual to all degrees of Mankind; I was flatter'd

to

Preface to the Reader.

to think it might be of some use in the World ; especially to those who thought either that there was no need of Revelation at all, or that the Revelation of our Saviour required the Belief of such Articles for Salvation, which the settled Notions and their way of reasoning in some, and want of Understanding in others, made impossible to them. Upon these two Topicks the Objections seemed to turn, which were with most Assurance, made by *Deists* against *Christianity* ; But against *Christianity* misunderstood. It seem'd to me, that there needed no more to shew them the Weakness of their Exceptions, but to lay plainly before them the Doctrine of our Saviour and his Apostles, as delivered in the Scriptures, and not as taught by the several Sects of Christians.

a 2

Preface to the Reader.

stians. This tempted me to publish it, not thinking it deserved an Opposition from any Minister of the Gospel ; and least of all, from any one in the Communion of the Church of *England*. But so it is, that Mr. *Edwards's* Zeal for he knows not what (for he does not yet know his own Creed, nor what is required to make him a Christian) could not brook so plain, simple, and intelligible a Religion : But yet not knowing what to say against it, and the Evidence it has from the Word of God, he thought fit to let the Book alone, and fall upon the Author. What great Matter he has done in it I need not tell you, who have seen and shew'd the Weakness of his Wranglings. You have here, Sir, the true History of the Birth of my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, as
delivered

Preface to the Reader.

delivered in the Scriptures, and my Design in publishing it, &c. What it contains, and how much it tends to Peace and Union amongst Christians, if they would receive Christianity as it is, you have discovered. I am,

S I R,

Your most humble Servant

A. B.

*My Readers will pardon me that in my Preface to them I make this particular Address to Mr. Bold. He hath thought it worth his while to defend my Book. How well he has done it, I am too much a Party to say : I think it so sufficient to Mr. Edwards, that I needed not have troubled my self any further
about*

Preface to the Reader.

about him on the account of any Argument that remains in his Book to be Answer'd. But a great part of the World judging of Contests about Truth, as they do of popular Elections, that the Side carries it where the greatest Noise is; 'twas necessary they should be undeceived, and be let see, that sometimes such Writers may be let alone, not because they cannot, but because they deserve not to be answer'd.

This farther I ought to Acknowledge to Mr. Bold, and own to the World, that he hath entered into the true sence of my Treatise, and his Notions do so perfectly agree with mine, that I shall not be afraid by Thoughts and Expressions very like his in this my Second Vindication, to give Mr. Edwards (who is exceedingly quick-sighted and positive in such Matters) a handle, to tell the
World,

Preface to the Reader.

World, that either I borrowed this my Vindication from Mr. Bold, or writ his Animadversions for him. The former of these I shall count no discredit, if Mr. Edwards think fit to charge me with it : And the latter Mr. Bold's Character, is Answer enough to. Though the Impartial Reader, I doubt not, will find that the same Uniform Truth consider'd by us, suggested the same Thoughts to us both, without any other Communication.

There is another Author, who in a Civiller Stile hath made it necessary for me to Vindicate my Book from a Reflection or two of his, wherein he seems to come short of that Candor he Professes. All that I shall say on this Occasion here is, that it is a wonder to me, that having published what I thought the Scripture told me was the Faith that made a Christian,
and

Pretace to the Reader.

and desired that if I was mistaken, any one that thought so, would have the goodness to inform me better; so many with their Tongues, and some in Print, should intemperately find fault with a poor Man out of his Way, who desires to be set right; and no one who blames his Faith, as coming short, will tell him what that Faith is which is required to make him a Christian. But, I hope, that amongst so many Censurers, I shall at last find one, who knowing himself to be a Christian upon other Grounds than I am, will have so much Christian Charity as to shew me what more is absolutely necessary to be believed by me, and every Man, to make him a Christian.

A Second Vindication of the Reasonableness of Christianity, &c.

A Cause that stands in need of Falshoods to support it, and an Adversary that will make use of them deserve nothing but Contempt; which I doubt not but every considerate Reader thought Answer enough to Mr. *Edwards's Socinianism Unmask'd*. But since in his late *Socinian Creed*, he says, *I would have answer'd him if I could*, That the Interest of Christianity may not suffer by my silence, nor the contemptibleness of his Treatise afford him matter of Triumph amongst those who lay any weight on such boasting, 'tis fit it should be shewn what an Arguer he is, and how well he deserves for his Performance to be dubb'd by himself *Irrefragable*.

Those, who like Mr. *Edwards*, dare to publish Inventions of their own for Matters of Fact, deserve a name so abhorr'd, that it finds not room in civil Conversation. This secures him from the proper Answer due to his Imputa-

A

tions

tions to me in Print of Matters of Fact utterly false, which without any Reply of mine, fix upon him that Name (which without a profligate Mind, a Man cannot expose himself to) till he hath proved them. Till then he must wear what he has put upon himself. This being a Rule which common Justice hath prescribed to the private Judgments of Mankind, as well as to the publick Judicatures of Courts, That all Allegations of Fact brought by contending Parties should be presum'd to be false till they are proved.

There are two ways of making a Book unanswerable. The one is by the clearness, strength and fairness of the argumentation. Men who know how to write thus, are above bragging what they have done, or boasting to the World that their Adversaries are *baffled*. Another way to make a Book unanswerable, is to lay stress on Matters of Fact foreign to the Question, as well as to Truth; and to stuff it with Scurrility and Fiction. This hath been always so evident to common sense, that no Man who had any regard to Truth or Ingenuity, ever

ever thought Matters of Fact besides the Argument, and Stories made at pleasure, the way of managing Controversies. Which shewing only the want of Sense and Argument, could, if used on both sides, end in nothing but downright railing: And he must always have the better of the Cause, who has Lying and Impudence on his side.

The *Unmasker* in the Entrance of his Book, sets a great distance between his and my way of Writing. I am not sorry that mine differs so much as it does from his. If it were like his, I should think, like his, it wanted the Author's Commendations. For, in his first Paragraph, which is all laid out in his own Testimony of his own Book, he so earnestly bespeaks an opinion of Mastery in Politeness, Order, Coherence, Pertinence, Strength, Seriousness, Temper, and all the good Qualities requisite in Controversie, that I think, since he pleases himself so much with his own good opinion, one in pity ought not to go about to rob him of so considerable an Admirer. I shall not therefore contest any of those Ex-

A 2 cellencies

A Second Vindication of the

cellencies he ascribes to himself, or Faults he blames in me in the management of the Dispute between us, any further than as particular Passages of his Book, as I come to examine them, shall suggest unavoidable Remarks to me. I think the World does not so much concern it self about him or me, that it need be told, in that Inventory he has given of his own good Parts in his first Paragraph, which of us two has the better hand at *Flourishes, Jestings, and Common-Places*; If I am, as he says, *pag. 2.* troubled with *angry Fits and passionate Ferments, which though I strive to palliate, are easily discernable, &c.* and he be more laudably Ingenuous in the openness of that Temper, which he shews in every Leaf, I shall leave to him the entire glory of boasting of it. Whatever we brag of our Performances, they will be just as they are, however he may think to add to his by his own Encomiums of them. The difference in Stile, Order, Coherence, good Breeding (for all those amongst others the *Unmasker* mentions) the Reader will observe, whatever I say of them: and
at

at best they are nothing to the question in hand. For, though I am a *Tool*, *Pert*, *Childish*, *Starch'd*, *Impertinent*, *Incoherent*, *Trifling*, *Weak*, *Passionate*, &c. Commendations I meet with before I get to the 4th. Page, besides what follows as *Upstart Racovian*, p. 24. *Flourishing Scribler*, p. 41. *Dissembler*, 106. *Pedantick*, 107. I say, although I am all this, and what else he liberally bestows on me in the rest of his Book, I may have truth on my side, and that in the present case serves my turn.

Having thus placed the Laurels upon his own Head, and sung Applause to his own Performance, he, *pag. 4.* enters, as he thinks, upon his Business, which ought to be, as he confesses, *pag. 3. to make good his former charges.* The first whereof he sets down in these words. That *I unwarrantably crowded all the necessary Articles of Faith into one, with a design of favouring Socinianism.*

If it may be permitted to the subdued to be so bold with one, who is already Conqueror, I desire to know, where that Proposition is laid down in these terms as laid to my Charge.

A 3

Whether

A Second Vindication of the

Whether it be true, or false, shall, if he pleases, be hereafter examined: But it is not at present the Matter in question. There are certain Propositions, which he having affirm'd and I denied, are under debate between us: And that the Dispute may not run into an endless ramble by multiplying of new before the Points in contest are decided, those ought first to be brought to an issue.

To go on therefore in the order of his *Socinianism Unmask'd* (for p. 3. he has out of the Mishna taught me good Breeding, *to answer the First first, and so in order*) the next thing he has against me, is p. 5. which, that the Reader may understand the force of, I must inform him, that in the 105. p. of his *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*, he said, that I give this plausible conceit, as he calls it, over and over again in these formal words, viz. "That nothing is required to be believed by any Christian man but this, that Jesus is the Messiah. This I denied. To make it good, *Socinianism Unmask'd*, p. 5. he thus argues, First, *It is observable, that this guilty Man would be*
shifting

shifting off the Indictment, by excepting against the formality of Words, as if such were not to be found in his Book : But when doth he do this ? in the close of it, when his Matter was exhausted, and he had nothing else to say, Vind. p. 38. then he bethinks himself of this salvo, &c.

Answ. As if a Falshood were ever the less a Falshood, because it was not opposed ; or would grow into a Truth if it were not taken notice of, before the 38th. Page of the Answer. I desire him to shew me these *formal words over and over again* in my *Reasonableness of Christianity* : Nor let him hope to evade by saying, I would be *shifting by excepting against the formality of the words.*

To say that *I have over and over again those formal words* in my Book, is an Assertion of a Matter of Fact; let him produce the words, and justify his Allegation ; or confess, that this is an Untruth publish'd to the World : And since he makes so bold with Truth in a Matter visible to every Body, let the World be Judge, what Credit is to be given to his Allegations of Matters of Fact, in things foreign to what

A Second Vindication of the

I have Printed ; and that are not capable of a Negative Proof. A sample whereof the Reader has at the entrance in his *Introduction*, Page *A 4*, and the three or four following Pages. Where he affirms to the World not only what I know to be false ; but what every one must see, he could not know to be true. For he pretends to know and deliver my Thoughts. And what the Character is of one that confidently affirms what he does not know, no body need be told.

But he adds, *I had before Pleaded to the Indictment, and thereby owned it to be true.* This is to make good his Promise, *p. 3.* to keep at a distance from *my feeble strugglings.* Here this strong Arguer must prove, that what is not answer'd or deny'd in the very beginning of a Reply, or before the 38th. Page, *is owned to be true.* In the mean time till he does that, I shall desire such of my Readers as think the *Unmasker's* Veracity worth the examining to see in my *Vindication*, from *p. 26.* to 31. wherein is contain'd, what I have said about *one Article*, whether I have owned, what

what he charged me with, on that Subject.

This Proposition then remains upon him still to be proved, *viz.*

I.

That I have over and over again these formal words in my Reasonableness of Christianity, viz. That nothing is required to be believed by any Christian Man, but this, That Jesus is the Messiah.

He goes on pag. 5. And indeed he could do no other, for it was the main Work he set himself about to find but one Article of Faith in all the Chapters of the four Evangelists, and the Acts of the Apostles. This is to make good his Promise, pag. 3. To clear his Book from those sorry Objections and Cavils I had raised against it. Several of my sorry Objections and Cavils were to represent to the Reader, that a great part of what he said was nothing but *Suspensions* and *Conjectures*, and such he could not but then own them to be. But now he has rid himself of all his *Conjectures*, and has raised them up into

A Second Vindication of the

into direct positive Affirmations, which being said with Confidence without Proof, who can deny, but he has clear'd, thoroughly clear'd that part from my *sorry Objections and Cavils* ? He says *it was the main Work I set my self about to find but one Article of Faith*. This I must take the liberty to deny : And I desire him to prove it. A Man may *set himself to find two*, or as many as there be, and yet find but one : Or a Man may *set himself to find but one*, and yet find two or more. It is no Argument from what a Man has found, to prove what was his *main Work* to find, unless where his aim was only to find what there was, whether more or less. For a Writer may find the Reputation of a poor contemptible Railer ; Nay, of a downright impudent Lyar, and yet no body will think it was his main work to find that. Therefore Sir, if you will not find what 'tis like you did not seek, you must prove those many confident Assertions, you have published, which I shall give you in tale whereof this is the second, *viz.*

II. That

II.

That the main Business I set my self about, was to find but one Article of Faith.

In the following part of this Sentence, he quotes my own words, with the Pages where they are to be found; The first time, that, in either of his two Books against me, he has vouchsafed to do so, concerning *one Article*, wherewith he has made so much noise. My words in pag. 192. of my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, stand thus:

“ *For that this is the sole Doctrine*
 “ *pressed and required to be believed*
 “ *in the whole tenor of our Saviour’s and*
 “ *his Apostles preaching, we have shew’d*
 “ *through the whole History of the Evan-*
 “ *lists and Acts, and I challenge them to*
 “ *shew that there was any other Doctrine*
 “ *upon their assent to which, or disbelief*
 “ *of it, Men were pronounced Believers*
 “ *or Unbelievers, and accordingly recei-*
 “ *ved into the Church of Christ, as*
 “ *Members of his Body, as far as mere*
 “ *Believing could make them so; or*
 “ *else kept out. This was the only Go-*
 “ *spel*

A Second Vindication of the

“ *spel Article of Faith which was preached to them.* Out of this Passage, the *Unmasker* sets down these words, “ *This is the SOLE Doctrine pressed and required to be believed in the whole tenor of our Saviour’s and his Apostles preaching,* p. 129. *this was the ONLY Gospel Article of Faith which was preach’d to them.*

I shall pass by all other Observations, that this way of citing these words would suggest, and only remark, that if he brought these words to prove the immediately preceding Assertion of his, *viz. That to find but one Article of Faith was the main Work I set my self about.* This Argument reduced into form will stand thus.

He who says, that this is the sole Doctrine pressed and required to be believed, in the whole tenor of our Saviour’s and his Apostles Preaching, upon their assent to which, or disbelief of it, Men were pronounced Believers or Unbelievers, and accordingly received into the Church of Christ, as Members of his Body, as far as mere believing could make them so, or else kept out, sets himself

self to find out but One Article of Faith, as his main Work. But the Vindicator did so: *Ergo*:

If this were the use he would make of those words of mine cited, I must desire him to prove the *major*. But he talks so freely, and without book, every where, that I suppose he thought himself, by the Privilege of a Disclaimer, exempt from being called strictly to an Account for what he so loosely says, and from proving what he should be called to Account for. Rail lustily, is a good Rule, something of it will stick, true or false, proved or not proved.

If he alledges these words of mine, to answer my Demand, *Vind. p. 27.* where he found that *I contended for one single Article of Faith, with the exclusion and defiance of all the rest* which he had charged me with. I say, it proves this as little as the former. For to say, " That I had
" shew'd through the whole History
" of the *Evangelists*, and the *Acts*,
" that this is the sole Doctrine, or
" only Gospel-Article pressed and re-
" quired to be believed in the whole
" Te-

“ Tenor of our Saviour and his Apo-
 “ stles Preaching ; upon their assent
 “ to which, or disbelieving of it,
 “ Men were pronounced Believers or
 “ Unbelievers, and accordingly re-
 “ ceived into the Church of Christ,
 “ or kept out ; is the simple Assertion
 of a positive Matter of Fact, and so
 carries in it no *defiance*, no, nor *exclu-*
sion of any other Doctrinal or Histo-
 rical Truth contained in the Scripture :
 And therefore it remains still on the
Unmasker to shew where 'tis I express
 any *defiance* of any other Truth con-
 tain'd in the Word of God ; or where
 I exclude any one Doctrine of the
 Scriptures. So that if it be true, that
 I *contend for one Article*, my Conten-
 tion may be without any *defiance*, or
 so much as *exclusion* of any of the rest,
 notwithstanding any thing contained
 in these words. Nay, if it should hap-
 pen that I am in a mistake, and that
 this was not the sole Doctrine which
 our Saviour and his Apostles preached,
 and upon their assent to which, Men
 were admitted into the Church ; yet
 the *Unmasker's* Accusation would be
 never the truer for that, unless it be
 necessary,

necessary, that he that mistakes in one Matter of Fact, should be at *defiance* with all other Truths ; or, that he who erroneously says, that our Saviour and his Apostles admitted Men into the Church upon the believing him to be the *Messiah*, does thereby exclude all other Truths published to the Jews before, or to Christian Believers afterwards.

If these words be brought to prove, that I contended for *one Article*, barely *one Article*, without any *defiance* or *exclusion* annexed to that Contention ; I say, neither do they prove that, as is manifest from the words themselves, as well as from what I said elsewhere concerning the Article of One God. For here, I say, this is the only *Gospel-Article*, &c. upon which Men were pronounced Believers ; which plainly intimates some other Article known and believed in the World before, and without the Preaching of the Gospel.

To this the *Unmasker* thinks he has provided a *Salvo* in these words, *Socinianism Unmask'd*, pag. 6. *And when I told him of this one Article, he knew well enough that I did not exclude the*
Article

A Second Vindication of the

Article of the Deity, for that is a Principle of Natural Religion. If it be fit for an *Unmasker* to perceive what is in debate, he would know, that the Question is not, what he *excluded* or *excluded not*, but what Articles he charged me to have *excluded*.

Taking it therefore to be his meaning (which it must be, if he meant any thing to the purpose,) *viz.* That when he charged me so often and positively for contesting for *one Article*, *viz.* that *Jesus was the Messiah*, he did not intend to accuse me for excluding *the Article of the Deity*. To prove that he did not so intend it, he tells me, that I *knew that he did not*.

Answ. How should I know it? he never told me so either in his Book, or otherwise. This I know, that he said, *pag. 115.* That I *contended for one Article, with the exclusion of all the rest*. If then the belief of the Deity, be an Article of Faith, and be not the Article of *Jesus being the Messiah*, it is one of *the rest*; and if *all the rest* were excluded, certainly that being one of *All the rest*, must be excluded. How then he could say, I *knew that he excluded*

cluded it not, i. e. meant not that I *excluded* it, when he positively says I did *exclude* it, I cannot tell, unless he thought that I knew him so well, that when he said one thing, I knew that he meant another, and that the quite contrary.

He now it seems acknowledges that I affirmed, that the Belief of the Deity, as well as of *Jesus* being the *Messiah*, was required to make a Man a Believer. The Believing in *one God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth*, is one Article; and in *Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord*, is another Article. These therefore being *two Articles*, and both asserted by me to be required to make a Man a Christian, let us see with what truth or ingenuity the *Unmasker* could apply, besides that above-mention'd, these following Expressions to me, as he does without any exception. *Why then must there be one Article, and no more?* pag. 115. *Going to make a Religion for his Mermidons, he contracts all into one Article, and will trouble them with no more,* pag. 117. *Away with Systems, away with Creeds, let us have but one*

B Article,

Article, *though it be* with the defiance of all the rest, pag. 118. *Thus we see why he reduces all Belief to that one Article before rehearsed,* pag. 120. And all this without any the least Exception of the *Article of a Deity*, as he now pretends. Nor could he indeed, as is evident from his own words, pag. 121, 122. *To conclude, This Gentleman and his Fellows are resolved to be Unitarians, they are for one Article of Faith, as well as one Person in the Godhead: — But if these learned Men were not prejudiced — they would perceive, that when the Catholick Faith is thus brought down to one single Article, it will soon be reduced to none, the Unite will dwindle into a Cypher.* By which the Reader may see, that his Intention was, to persuade the World, that I reduced *ALL BELIEF*, the *CATHOLICK FAITH* (they are his own words) to *One Single Article and no more*. For if he had given but the least hint, that I allowed of *Two*, all the wit and strength of Argument contained in *Unitarians, Unite, and Cypher*, with which he winds up all, had been utterly lost, and dwindled into palpable Nonsense. To

To demonstrate that this was the sense he would be understood in, we are but to observe what he says again, pag. 50. of his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, where he tells his Readers, That *I, and my Friends, have new-modell'd the Apostles Creed ; yea indeed, have presented them with ONE Article, instead of TWELVE.* And hence we may see what Sincerity there is in the Reason he brings to prove that he did not exclude the *Article of the Deity.* For, says he, p. 6. *That is a Principle of Natural Religion.*

Ans. Ergo, He did not in positive words, without any exception, say, I reduced *All Belief, the Catholick Faith, to one single Article, and no more.* But to make good his Promise, not to resemble me in the little Artifices of Evading, he wipes his Mouth, and says at the bottom of this Page, *But the Reader sees his [the Vindicator's] shuffling.* Whilst the Article of One God is a part of *ALL Belief, a part of the Catholick Faith,* ALL which he affirm'd I excluded, but the one Article concerning the *Messiah*, every one will see where the *shuffling* is : And

if it be not clear enough from those words themselves, let those above quoted out of *pag. 50.* of his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, where he says, *That I have new-modell'd the Apostles Creed, and presented the World with ONE Article instead of TWELVE*, be an Interpretation of them. For if the Article of *One Eternal God, Maker of Heaven and Earth*, be one of the Article of the Apostles Creed, and the one Article I *presented* them with be not that, 'tis plain, he did and would be understood to mean, that by my one Article, I excluded that of the *One Eternal God*, which Branch soever of Religion, either Natural or Revealed, it belongs to.

I do not endeavour to *persuade the Reader*, as he says, *p. 6.* that he *misunderstood me*; but yet every body will see, that he *mis-represented me*. And I challenge him to say, that those Expressions above quoted out of him, concerning *One Article*, in the obvious fence of the words, as they stand in his Accusation of me, were true?

This

This flies so directly in his Face, that he labours mightily to get it off, and therefore adds these words, *My Discourse did not treat (neither doth his Book run that way) of Principles of Natural Religion, but of the Revealed, and particularly the Christian: Accordingly this was it which I taxed him with, That of all the Principles and Articles of Christianity, he chose out but One as necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian.*

Ans. His Book was of ——— *Atheism*, which one may think should make his *Discourse treat of Natural Religion*. But I pass by that, and bid him tell me where he taxed me, *That of all the Principles and Articles of Christianity I chose out but One*: Let him shew in all his *Discourse* but such a word, or any thing said like *one Article of Christianity*, and I will grant that he meant particularly, but spoke generally; misled his Reader, and left himself a Subterfuge. But if there be no Expression to be found in him tending that way, all this is but the covering of one Falshood with another, which thereby only becomes the grosser.

Though if he had in exprefs words taxed me, *That of all the Principles and Articles of the Christian Religion, I chose out but one*, that would not at all help him, till he further declares, that the Belief of One God is not an *Article of the Christian Religion*. For of *ALL the Articles of the Christian Religion*, he says, *I chose but One*; which not being that of a Deity, his words plainly import, that that was left out among the rest, unless it be possible for a Man to chuse but One Article of the Christian Religion, *viz.* That *Jesus is the Messiah*; and at the same time to chuse Two Articles of the Christian Religion, *viz.* That there is One Eternal God, and that *Jesus is the Messiah*. If he had spoken clearly, and like a fair Man, he should have said, That he taxed me with chusing but One Article of Revealed Religion. This had been plain and direct to his purpose: But then he knew the Falshood of it would be too obvious: for in the seven Pages wherein he taxes me so much with *One Article*, Christianity is several times named, though not once to the purpose
he

he here pretends. But Revelation is not so much as once mentioned in them, nor, as I remember, in any of the Pages he bestows upon me.

To conclude, the several Passages above quoted out of him, concerning *one sole Article*, are all in general terms, without any the least limitation or restriction; and as they stand in him, fit to persuade the Reader that I excluded all other Articles whatsoever, but that one of *Jesus the Messiah*: And if in that sense they are not true, they are so many Falshoods of his repeated there, to mislead others into a wrong Opinion of me. For if he had had a mind his Readers should have been rightly informed, why was it not as easie once to explain himself, as so often to affirm it in general and unrestrained terms? This all the boasted strength of the *Unmasker* will not be able to get him out of. This very well becomes one who so loudly charges me with *Shuffling*. Having repeated the same thing over and over again, in as general terms as was possible, without any the least limitation in the whole Discourse, to have no-

thing else to plead when required to prove it, but that it was meant in a limited sense, in an *Unmasker*, is not *shuffling*. For by this way he may have the convenience to say and unsay what he pleases ; to vent what stuff he thinks for his turn ; and when he is called to an Account for it, reply, He meant no such thing. Should any one publish, that the *Unmasker* had but *One Article of Faith, and no more, viz.* That the Doctrines in fashion, and likely to procure Preferment, are alone to be received ; That *all his Belief* was comprised in this *one single Article* : And when such a Talker was demanded to prove his Assertion, should he say, he meant, to except his Belief of the Apostles Creed : Would he not, notwithstanding such a Plea, be thought a *shuffling Lyar* ? And if the *Unmasker* can no otherwise prove those universal Propositions above-cited, but by saying, he meant them with a tacit restriction, (for none is expressed) they will still and for ever remain to be accounted for by his Veracity.

What

What he says in the next Paragraph, p. 7. of my *splitting One Article into Two*, is just of the same force, and with the same ingenuity. I had said, That the Belief of One God was necessary ; which is not now denied : I had also said, “ That the Belief of “ *Jesus of Nazareth* to be the *Messiah*, “ together with those concomitant “ Articles of his Resurrection, Rule, “ and coming again to Judge the “ World, was necessary, p. 291. And “ again, p. 301. That God had declared, whoever would believe *Jesus* “ to be the Saviour promised, and “ take him now raised from the Dead, “ and constituted the Lord and Judge “ of all Men, to be their King and “ Ruler, shall be saved.” This made me say *These* and *Those Articles* (in words of the plural number) more than once ; Evidence enough to any but a Caviller, that I *contended not for one single Article and no more*. And to mind him of it, I in my *Vindication*, reprinted one of those places where I had done so ; and that he might not, according to his manner, overlook what does not please him, the

the words, **THESE ARE ARTICLES**, were printed in great Characters. Whereupon he makes this Remark, *p. 7. And though since he has tried to split this One into Two, pag. 28. yet he labours in vain : For to believe Jesus to be the Messiah, amounts to the same with believing him to be King and Ruler ; his being Anointed (i. e. being the Messiah) including that in it : Yet he has the vanity to add in great Characters, **THESE ARE ARTICLES** ; as if the putting them into these great letters, would make One Article Two.*

Answ. Though no Letters will make One Article Two ; yet that there is One God, and Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord, who rose again from the Dead, ascended into Heaven, and sitteth at the Right-Hand of God, shall come to judge the Quick and the Dead, are more than One Article, and may very properly be called **THESE ARTICLES**, without splitting One into Two.

What, in my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, I have said of *One Article*, I shall always own ; and in what sense I said it, is easie to be understood ; and
with

with a Man of the least Candour, whose Aim was Truth, and not Wrangling, it would not have occasion'd one word of Dispute. But as for this *Unmasker*, who made it his business not to convince me of any Mistakes in my Opinion, but barely to mis-represent me ; my business at present with him, is, to shew the World, that what he has captiously and scurrilously said of me relating to *One Article*, is false ; and that he neither has nor can prove one of those Assertions concerning it, above-cited out of him in his own words. Nor let him pretend a Meaning against his direct Words : Such a Caviller as he, who would shelter himself under the pretence of a Meaning, whereof there are no Footsteps, whose Disputes are only Calumnies directed against the Author, without examining the Truth or Falshood of what I had published, is not to expect the Allowances one would make to a fair and ingenuous Adversary, who shew'd so much Concern for Truth, that he treated of it with a Seriousness due to the weightiness of the Matter, and used other Arguments besides Obloquy,
Clamour

Clamour and Falshoods, against what he thought Error. And therefore I again positively demand of him to prove these words of his to be true, or confess that he cannot : *Viz.*

III.

That I contend for One Article of Faith, with the exclusion and defiance of all the rest.

Two other Instances of this sort of Arguments I gave in the 29th. Page of my *Vindication*, out of the 115th. and 119th. Pages of his *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*, and I here demand of him again to shew, since he has not thought fit hitherto to give any Answer to it,

IV.

Where I urge, that there must be nothing in Christianity, that is not plain, and exactly levelled to all Mens Mother Wit, and every common Apprehension.

Or where he finds, in my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, this other Proposition :

V. *That*

V.

That the very manner of every thing in Christianity must be clear and intelligible ; every thing must immediately be comprehended by the weakest Noddle, or else it is no part of Religion, espically of Christianity.

These things he must prove that I have said : I put it again upon him to shew where I said them, or else to confess the Forgery : For till he does one or t'other, he shall be sure to have these, with a large Catalogue of other Falshoods, laid before him.

Pag. 25. of his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, he endeavours to make good his saying, that *I set up One Article, with defiance of all the rest, in these words ; For what is excluding them wholly, but defying them ? Wherefore, seeing he utterly excludes all the rest, by representing them as USELESS to the making a Man a Christian, which is the design of his whole Undertaking, it is manifest that he defies them.*

Answ. This at least is manifest from hence, that the *Unmasker* knows not, or cares not what he says. For whoever,

ever, but he, thought that a bare *Exclusion*, or passing by, was *Defiance*? If he understands it so, I would advise him not to seek Preferment. For Exclusions will happen; and if every *Exclusion* be *Defiance*, a Man had need be well assured of his own good Temper, who shall not think his Peace and Charity in danger, amongst so many Enemies that are at *defiance* with him? *Defiance*, if with any propriety it can be spoken of an Article of Faith, must signify a professed Enmity to it. For in its proper use, which is to Persons, it signifies an open and declared Enmity raised to that height, that he in whom it is, challenges the Party *defied* to Battle, that may there wreak his hatred on his Enemy in his Destruction. So that *my Defiance of all the rest* remains still to be proved.

But, *Secondly*, There is another thing *manifest* from these words of his, *viz.* That notwithstanding his great Brags in his first Paragraph, his main Skill lies, in fancying what would be for his turn, and then confidently fathering it upon me. It never enter'd into my Thoughts, nor, I think,
into

into any body's else, (I must always except the acute *Unmasker*, who makes no difference between *Useful* and *Necessary*) that all but the fundamental Articles of the Christian Faith were *useless* to make a Man a Christian; though, if it be true, that the Belief of the Fundamentals alone (be they few or many) is all that is *necessary* to his being made a Christian, all that may any way persuade him to believe them, may certainly be useful towards the making him a Christian: And therefore here again I must propose to him, and leave it with him to be shew'd, Where it is,

VI.

I have represented all the rest as useless to the making a Man a Christian? And, How it appears, that this is the design of my whole Undertaking?

In his Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism, he says, pag. 115. *what makes him contend for one single Article with the exclusion of all the rest? He pretends it is this, that all Men ought to understand their Religion.* This reasoning

soning I disowned *p. 26.* of my *Vindication*, and intimated *p. 27.* that he should have quoted the Page where I so pretended. To this *p. 26.* he tells me with great confidence, and in abundance of words; as we shall see by and by, that I had done so: As if repetition were a Proof. He had done better to have quoted one place, where I so pretend. Indeed *p. 27.* for want of something better, he quotes these words of mine out of *p. 301.* of the *Reasonableness of Christianity*. *The all merciful God seems herein to have consulted the poor of this World, and the bulk of Mankind. THESE ARE ARTICLES that the labouring and illiterate Man may comprehend.* I ask whether it be possible for one to bring any thing more direct against himself? The thing he was to prove was, That *I contended for one single Article with the exclusion of all the rest, because I pretended, that all Men ought to understand their Religion, i. e.* The Reason I gave, why there was to be *but one single Article in Religion with the exclusion of all the rest,* was, because Men ought to understand their Religion, and the place he brings

brings to prove my *contending* upon that ground *for one single Article with the exclusion of all the rest*, is a passage wherein I speak of more than one Article, and say *these Articles*. Whether I said *These Articles* properly or improperly, it matters not in the present case (and that we have examin'd in another place) 'tis plain, I meant more than one Article, when I said *these Articles*; and did not think, that the labouring and illiterate Man could not understand them, if they were more than one: And therefore I *pretended* not, that there must be but one, because by illiterate Men more than one could not be understood. The rest of this Paragraph is nothing but a repetition of the same Assertion without Proof, which with the *Unmasker* often passes for a way of proving, but with no body else.

But, that I may keep that distance, which he boasts there is betwixt his and my way of writing, I shall not say this without Proofs. One instance of his repetition, of which there is such plenty in his Book, pray take here. His Business *p. 26.* is to prove,
C that

that I pretended that I contended for one single Article with the exclusion of all the rest, because all Men ought to understand their Religion. Pag. 27. of my *Vindication*, I denied that I had so pretended. To convince me that I had, thus he proceeds.

Unmasker. *He founds his Conceit of one Article partly upon this, that a multitude of Doctrines is obscure, and hard to be understood.*

Answer. You say it, and had said it before : But I ask you, as I did before, where I did so ?

Unm. *And therefore he trusses all up in one Article, that the poor People and bulk of Mankind may bear it.*

Answer. I desire again to know where I made that Inference, and argued so for one Article.

Unm. *This is the scope of a great part of his Book.*

Answer. This is saying again, shew it once.

Unm. *But his Memory does not keep pace with his Invention, and thence he says, he remembers nothing of this in his Book, Vind. p. 27.*

Answer.

Answ. This is to say, that it is in my Book. You have said it more than once already; I demand of you to shew me where?

Unm. *This worthy Writer does not know his own reasoning, that he uses.*

Answ. I ask where does he use that reasoning?

Unm. *As particularly thus, that he troubles Christian Men with no more, but one Article: BECAUSE that is intelligible, and all people high and low may comprehend it.*

Answ. We have heard it affirm'd by you over and over again, but the question still is, where is that way of arguing to be found in my Book?

Unm. *For he has chosen out, as he thinks, a plain and easie Article. Whereas the others, which are commonly propounded, are not generally agreed on (he saith), and are dubious and uncertain. But the believing that Jesus was the Messiah has nothing of doubtfulness, or obscurity in it.*

Answ. The word *For* in the beginning of this Sentence makes it stand, for one of your Reasons; though it be but a repetition of the same thing in other words.

A Second Vindication of the

Unm. *T H I S* the Reader will find to be the drift and design of several of his Pages.

Answ. This must signifie, that I trouble Men with no more but one Article because one only is intelligible, and then it is but a Repetition. If any thing else be meant by the word *This*, it is nothing to the purpose. For that I said, that all things necessary to be believed are plain in Scripture, and easie to be understood, I never denied; And should be very sorry, and recant it if I had.

Unm. *And the reason, why I did not quote any single one of them, was, because he insists on it so long together: and spins it out after his way, in p. 301. of his Reasonableness of Christianity, where he sets down the “ short, “ plain, easie and intelligible Sum- “ mary (as he calls it) of Religion, “ couch’d in a single Article: He im- “ mediately adds; The All-merciful “ God seems herein to have consulted “ the Poor of this World, and the “ Bulk of Mankind; these are Articles “ (whereas he had set down but one) “ that the labouring and illiterate Man “ may comprehend.*

Answ.

Answ. If *my insisting on it so long together*, was the cause why, in your *Thoughts of the Causes of Atheism*, you did not quote any single Passage; methinks here, in your *Socinianism Unmask'd*, where you knew it was expected of you, *my insisting on it*, as you say, *so long together*, might have afforded at least one Quotation to your purpose.

Unm. He assigns this as a Ground, why it was God's Pleasure that there should be but ONE POINT of Faith, BECAUSE thereby Religion may be understood the better; the generality of the People may comprehend it.

Answ. I hear you say it again, but want a Proof still, and ask where I assign that Ground?

Unm. This he represents as a great Kindness done by God to Man, whereas the variety of Articles would be hard to be understood.

Answ. Again the same Cabbage; an Affirmation, but no Proof.

Unm. This he enlarges upon, and flourishes it over after his fashion: and yet he desires to know, when he said so, p. 29. *Vindic.*

Answ. And if I did, Let the World here take a Sample of the *Unmasker's* Ability, or Truth, who spends above two whole Pages 26, 27. in repetitions of the same Assertion, without the producing any but one place, for Proof, and that too against him as I have shewn. But he has not yet done with confounding me by dint of repetition; he goes on.

Unm. Good Sir, let me be permitted to acquaint you, that your Memory is as defective as your Judgment.

Answ. I thank you for the regard you have had to it; for often repetition is a good help to a bad memory. In requital, I advise you to have some eye to your own Memory and Judgment too. For one or both of them seem a little to blame in the reason you subjoyn to the foregoing words, viz.

Unm. For in the very Vindication you attribute it to the goodness and condescension of the Almighty, that he requires nothing as absolutely necessary to be believed, but what is suited to vulgar capacities, and the comprehension of illiterate Men.

Answ.

Answ. I will for the *Unmasker's* sake put this Argument of his into a Syllogism. If the *Vindicator* in his *Vindication* attributes it to the goodness and condescension of the Almighty, that he requires nothing to be believed, but what is suited to vulgar Capacities, and the comprehension of illiterate Men, then he did in his *Reasonableness of Christianity* pretend, that the reason why he contended for one Article with the exclusion of all the rest was, because all Men ought to understand their Religion.

But the *Vindicator* in his *Vindication* attributes it to the goodness and condescension of Almighty God, that he requires nothing to be believed, but what is suited to vulgar Capacities, and the comprehension of illiterate Men.

Ergo in his *Reasonableness of Christianity*, he pretended, that the reason why he contended for one Article with the exclusion of all the rest was because all Men ought to understand their Religion.

This was the Proposition to be proved, and which as he confesses here

A Second Vindication of the

p. 26. I denied to remember to be in my *Reasonableness of Christianity*. Who can but admire his Logick !

But besides the strength of *Judgment*, which you have shew'd in this clear & cogent reasoning, does not your *Memory* too deserve its due applause ? You tell me in your *Socinianism Unmask'd*, that in p. 29. of my *Vindication*, I desired to know *when* I said so. To which desire of mine you reply in these words before cited, *Good Sir, Let me be permitted to acquaint you that your Memory is as defective as your Judgment ; for in the very Vindication you attribute it to the goodness and condescension of the Almighty, that he requires nothing as absolutely necessary to be believed, but what is suited to vulgar Capacities, and the comprehension of illiterate Men,* P. 30.

Sure the *Unmasker* thinks himself at cross questions. I ask him in the 29th. Page of my *Vindication*, *WHEN* I said so : And he answers, that I had said so in the 30th. Page of my *Vindication*, i. e. when I writ the 29th. Page, I asked the question *when* I had said what he charg'd me with saying, and

and I am answer'd, I had said it in the 30th. Page, which was not yet written, *i. e.* I ask the question to day *WHEN* I had said so: and I am answer'd, I had said it to Morrow. As apposite, and convincing an Answer to make good his charge, as if he had said to Morrow I found a Horse-shoe. But perhaps this judicious Disputant will ease himself of this difficulty by looking again into the 29th. *p.* of my *Vindication*, out of which he cites these words for mine, *I desire to know WHEN I said so.* But my words in that place, are *I desire to know WHERE I said so*; a mark of his exactness in quoting, when he vouchsafes to do it. For *Unmaskers*, when they turn Disputants, think it the best way to talk at large, and charge home in generals. But do not often find it convenient to quote Pages, set down words, and come to particulars. But if he had quoted my words right, his Answer had been just as pertinent. For I ask him *WHERE* in my *Reasonableness of Christianity* I had said so: And he answers, I had said so in my *Vindication*. For *where* in my question
refers

refers to my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, which the *Unmasker* had seen, and charged with this saying; and could not refer to my *Vindication*, which he had not yet seen; nor to a passage in it which was not then written. But this is nothing with an *Unmasker*, therefore what is yet worse, those words of mine, *Vindic.* p. 29. relate not to the passage he is here proving I had said; but to another different from it, as different as it is to say, *that because all Men are to understand their Religion, therefore there is to be but One Article in it*; And to say *that there must be nothing in Christianity, that is not plain and exactly levell'd to all Mens Mother Wit*: Both which he falsely charges on me, but 'tis only to the latter of them, that my words *I desire to know where I said so* are apply'd.

Perhaps the well-meaning Man sees no difference between these two Propositions, yet I shall take the liberty to ask him again, *where I said either of them*, as if they were two: although he should accuse me again of *excepting against the formality of words*, and doing

so foolish a thing as to expect, that a disputing *Unmasker* should account for his words, or any Proposition he advances. 'Tis his privilege to plead he did not mean as his words import, and without any more ado he is assoil'd; and he is the same *Unmasker* he was before. But let us hear him out on the Argument he was upon, for his repetitions on it are not yet done. His next words are,

Unm. *It is clear then, that you found your ONE Article on this, that it is suited to the vulgar Capacities: Whereas the other Articles, mentioned by me, are obscure and ambiguous, and therefore surpass the comprehension of the illiterate.*

Answ. The latter part indeed is now the first time imputed to me. But all the rest is nothing but an unproved repetition, though usher'd in with *it is clear then*; words that should have a Proof going before them.

Unm. *But yet you pretend, that you have forgot, that any such thing was said by you.*

Answ. I have indeed forgot, and notwithstanding all your pains by so many

A Second Vindication of the

many repetitions to beat it into my Head, I fear I shall never remember it.

Unm. *Which shews that you are careless of your words, and that you forget what you write.*

Answ. So you told me before, and this repeating of it does no more convince me, than that did.

Unm. *What shall we say to such an oblivious Author?*

Answ. Shew it him in his Book, or else he will never be able to remember, that it is there, nor any body else be able to find it.

Unm. *He takes no notice of what falls from his own Pen.*

Answ. So you have told him more than once. Try him once with shewing it him amongst other things which fell from his own Pen, and see what then he will say: That perhaps may refresh his Memory.

Unm. *And therefore within a Page or two he confutes himself, and gives himself the Lye.*

Answ. 'Tis a Fault he deserves to be told of over and over again. But he says, he shall not be able to find the two Pages, wherein he gives him-
self

self the Lye, unless you set down their Numbers, and the words in them, which confute, and which are confuted.

I beg my Reader's pardon for laying before him so large a pattern of our *Unmasker's* new fashioned Stuff; his fine Tissue of argumentation not easily to be match'd, but by the same Hand. But it lay altogether in p. 26, 27, & 28. and it was fit the Reader should have this one instance of the Excellencies, he promises in his first Paragraph in opposition to my *Impertinencies, Incoherencies, weak and feeble struglings*. Other Excellencies he there promised upon the same ground, which I shall give my Reader a taste of, in fit places. Not but that the whole is of a piece, and one cannot miss some of them in every Page: But to transcribe them all, would be more than they are worth. If any one desires more plenty, I send him to his Book it self. But saying a thousand times not being proving once, it remains upon him still to shew,

VII.

Where, in my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, I pretend that I contend for one single Article, with the exclusion of all the rest, because all Men ought to understand their Religion?

And in the next place, where it is that I say,

VIII.

That there must be nothing in Christianity that is not plain and exactly level to all Mens Mother Wit.

Let us now return to his 8th. Page. For the bundling together, as was fit, all that he has said in distant places upon the Subject of *One Article* has made me trespass a little against the *Jewish Character of a well-bred Man*, recommended by him to me out of the *Mishna*. Though I propose to myself to follow him, as near as I can, step by step, as he proceeds.

In

In the 110th. and 111th. Pages of his *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*, he gave us a List of his *Fundamental Articles*: Upon which I thus applied my self to him, *Vind.* p. 5.

“ Give me leave now to ask you fe-
“ riously, whether these you have
“ here set down under the title of
“ *Fundamental Doctrines* are such
“ (when reduced to Propositions)
“ that every one of them is requi-
“ red to make a Man a Christian,
“ and such as without the actual be-
“ lief thereof, he cannot be saved? If
“ they are not so every one of them,
“ you may call them *Fundamental Do-*
“ *ctrines* as much as you please, they
“ are not of those Doctrines of Faith,
“ I was speaking of; which are only
“ such as are required to be actually
“ believed to make a Man a Chri-
“ stian. And again, *Vindic.* p. 18. I
“ asked him whether just these nei-
“ ther more nor less” were those ne-
cessary Articles.

To which we have his Answer, *Socinianism Unmask'd*, p. 8, &c. From p. 8. to 20. he has quoted near Forty Texts of Scripture, of which he
faith

faith, p. 21. Thus I have briefly set before the Reader those *Evangelical Truths*, those *Christian Principles* which belong to the very *Essence of Christianity*: I have proved them to be such, and I have reduced most of them to certain *Propositions*, which is a thing the *Vindicator* called for.

Answ. Yes; But that was not all the *Vindicator* called for, and had reason to expect. For I asked, “whether
 “ those the *Unmasker* gave us in his
 “ *Thoughts concerning the Causes of A-*
 “ *theism*, were the Fundamental Do-
 “ctrines without an actual Belief
 “ whereof a Man could not be a
 “ Christian, just all neither more nor
 “ less”? This I had reason to demand from him, or from any one, who questions that part of my Book, and I shall insist upon till he does it, or confesses he cannot. For having set down the Articles, which the Scripture upon a diligent search seem'd to me to require as necessary, and only necessary, I shall not lose my time in examining, what another says against those Fundamentals, which I have gather'd out of the Preachings of our
 Saviour

Saviour and his Apostles, till he gives me a List of his Fundamentals, which he will bide by; that is by comparing them together, I may see which is the true Catalogue of Necessaries. For after so serious and diligent a search, which has given me Light and Satisfaction in this great Point, I shall not quit it, and set my self on float again, at the demand of any one who would have me be of his Faith, without telling me what it is. Those Fundamentals, the Scripture has so plainly given, and so evidently determin'd, that it would be the greatest folly imaginable to part with this Rule for asking; and give up my self blindly to the Conduct of one, who either knows not, or will not tell me, what are the Points necessary to be believed to make me a Christian. He that shall find fault with my Collection of Fundamentals only to unsettle me, and not to give me a better of his own, I shall not think worth minding, till, like a fair Man, he puts himself upon equal terms, and makes up the Defects of mine by a compleat one of his own. For a deficiency or error in one necessary is as fatal, and

as certainly excludes a Man from being a Christian, as in an hundred. When any one offers me a compleat Catalogue of his Fundamentals, he does not unreasonably demand me to quit mine for nothing : I have then one, that being set by mine, I may compare them; and so be able to chuse the true and perfect one, and relinquish the other.

He that does not do this, plainly declares, that (without shewing me the certain way to Salvation) he expects that I should depend on him with an implicit Faith, whilst he reserves to himself the liberty to require of me to believe, what he shall think fit, as he sees Occasion ; and in effect, says thus, “ Distrust those Fundamentals
 “ which the Preaching of our Sa-
 “ viour, and his Apostles, have shew’d
 “ to be all that is necessary to be be-
 “ lieved to make a Man a Christian,
 “ and though I cannot tell you, what
 “ are those other Articles, which are
 “ necessary and sufficient to make a
 “ Man a Christian, yet take me for
 “ your Guide, and that is as good, as
 “ if I made up, in a compleat List, the
 “ Defects

“ Defects of your Fundamentals”.
To which this is a sufficient Answer,
*Si quid novisti rectius imperti, si non, his
utere mecum.*

The *Unmasker* of his own accord,
p. 110. of his *Thoughts concerning the
Causes of Atheism*, sets down several,
which he calls *Fundamental Doctrines*.
I ask him, whether those be all? For
answer he adds more to them in his
Socinianism Unmask'd: But in a great
pet refuses to tell me, whether this
Second List of Fundamentals be com-
pleat: And instead of answering so
reasonable a Demand, pays me with
ill Language, in these words, pag. 22.
Subjoyn'd to those last quoted, *If what
I have said will not content him, I am
sure I can do nothing that will, and
therefore if he should Capriciously re-
quire any thing more, it would be as
great folly in me to comply with it, as
it is in him to move it.* If I did ask a
Question which troubles you, be not
so angry; you your self were the oc-
casion of it. I propos'd my Colle-
ction of Fundamentals, which I had
with great care sought; and thought
I had found clear in the Scripture;

you tell me no, it is imperfect, and offer me one of your own. I ask whether that be perfect? Thereupon you grow into Choler, and tell me 'tis a foolish Question. Why! then I think it was not very wise in you so forwardly to offer one, unless you had had one ready, not liable to the same exception. Would you have me so foolish to take a List of Fundamentals from you, who have not yet one for your self? nor are yet resolved with your self, what Doctrines are to be put in, or left out of it? Farther, pray tell me, if you had a settled Collection of Fundamentals, that you would stand to, why should I take them from you upon your word, rather than from an *Anabaptist*, or a *Quaker*, or an *Arminian*, or a *Socinian*, or a *Lutheran*, or a *Papist*? who, I think, are not perfectly agreed with you, or one another in Fundamentals? and yet there is none amongst them, that I have not as much reason to believe upon his bare word, as an *Unmasker*, who to my certain knowledge will make bold with Truth. If you set up for Infallibility, you may have some claim to
have

have your bare word taken, before any other but the Pope. But yet if you do demand to be an unquestionable Proposer of what is absolutely necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, you must perform it a little better, than hitherto you have done. For it is not enough sometimes to give us Texts of Scripture; Sometimes Propositions of your own framing; and sometimes Texts of Scripture out of which they are to be framed as p. 14. you say, *These and the like places afford us such Fundamental and Necessary Doctrines as these*: And again, p. 16. after the naming several other Texts of Scripture, you add *which places yield us such Propositions as these*, and then in both places set down, what you think fit to draw out of them. And Page 15. you have these words: *And here likewise it were easie to shew that Adoption, Justification, Pardon of Sins, &c. which are Privileges and Benefits bestow'd upon us by the Messiah, are Necessary Matters of our Belief*. By all which, as well as the whole frame, wherein you make shew of giving us your Funda-

mental Articles, it is plain, that what you have given us there, is nothing less than a compleat Collection of Fundamentals, even in your own Opinion of it.

But Good Sir, why is it a *foolish* Question in me? you have found fault with my Summary for being short: The defect in my Collection of Necessary Articles has raised your Zeal into so severe Censures, and drawn upon me from you so heavy a Condemnation, that if half that you have said of me be true, I am in a very ill case, for having so curtailed the Fundamental Doctrines of Christianity. Is it *folly* then for me to ask from you a compleat Creed? If it be so dangerous (as certainly it is) to fail in any necessary Article of Faith, why is it *folly* in me to be instant with you to give me them all? Or why is it *folly* in you to grant so reasonable a Demand? a short Faith, defective in Necessaries, is no more tolerable in you, than in me; nay, much more inexcusable, if it were for no other reason, but this, that you rest in it your self, and would impose it on others; and yet

yet do not your self know or believe it to be compleat. For if you do, why dare you not say so, and give it us all entire in plain Propositions? and not, as you have in great measure done here, give only the Texts of Scripture, from whence, you say, necessary Articles are to be drawn; which is too great an uncertainty for Doctrines absolutely necessary. For possibly all Men do not understand those Texts alike, and some may draw Articles out of them quite different from your Systeme; and so though they agree in the same Texts, may not agree in the same Fundamentals: and till you have set down plainly and distinctly your Articles, that you think contain'd in them, cannot tell whether you will allow them to be Christians, or no. For you know, Sir, several Inferences are often drawn from the same Text; and the different Systems of dissenting (I was going to say Christians, but that none must be so, but those who receive your Collection of Fundamentals, when you please to give it them) Professors, are all founded on the Scripture.

D 4

Why,

Why, I beseech you, is mine a *foolish* Question to ask, What are the necessary Articles of Faith? 'Tis of no less consequence than, nor much different from the Jaylor's Question in the 16th. of the Acts, *What shall I do to be saved?* and that was not, that ever I heard counted by any one a *foolish Question*. You grant there are Articles necessary to be believed for Salvation: would it not then be Wisdom to know them? nay, is it not our Duty to know and believe them? If not, why do you with so much outcry reprehend me, for not knowing them? why do you fill your Books with such variety of Invectives, as if you could never say enough, nor bad enough, against me, for having left out some of them? And if it be so dangerous, so criminal to miss any of them, why is it a *folly* in me to *move* you to give me a compleat List?

If Fundamentals are to be known, easie to be known (as without doubt they are) then a Catalogue may be given of them. But if they are not, it cannot certainly be determin'd which are they; but the doubtful
know:

Knowledge of them depends upon guesses, why may not I be permitted to follow my guesses, as well as you yours? Or why, of all others, must you prescribe your guesses to me, when there are so many, that are as ready to prescribe as you, and of as good Authority? The pretence indeed, and clamour is Religion, and the Saving of Souls: But your Business 'tis plain is nothing, but to overrule, and prescribe, and be hearken'd to as a Dictator; and not to inform, teach and instruct in the sure way to Salvation. Why else do you so start and fling, when I desire to know of you, what is necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, when this is the only material thing in Controversie between us, and my Mistakes in it has made you begin a quarrel with me, and let loose your Pen against me in no ordinary way of reprehension?

Besides in this way which you take, you will be in no better a case than I. For another having as good a claim to have his guesses give the rule, as you yours; or to have his System received,

ved, as well as you yours, he complain of you, as well, and upon good grounds, as you do of me, (if he have but as much Zeal for Orthodoxy as you shew for yours) as civil, well-bred and Christian Language.

In the next place, pray tell me, would it be *folly* in you to comply with what I require of you? Would it not be useful to me to be set right in this Matter, if so, why is it in you to set me right? Consider if you please, as one of your Partners, who (after you have refused which Catalogue of Fundamental Articles you will give him, either that in your *Theology of the Causes of Atheism*; or this in your *Socinianism Unmask'd*) they are not both the same, neither of them perfect) asked you, whether these all Fundamental Articles necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian; and are there no more? would you answer him, it was *folly* in you to comply with him, in what he desired? Is it a moment to know, what is required of Men to be believed; without a l

of which they are not Christians, nor can be saved? And is it *folly* in a Minister of the Gospel to inform one committed to his Instruction in so material a Point as this, which distinguishes Believers from Unbelievers? Is it *folly* in one whose Business it is to bring Men to be Christians, and to Salvation, to resolve a Question by which they may know, whether they are Christians or no, and without a resolution of which they cannot certainly know their Condition and the State they are in? Is it besides your Commission and Business, and therefore a *folly* to extend your care of Souls so far as this, to those who are committed to your Charge?

Sir, I have a Title to demand this of you, as if I were your Parishioner: You have forced your self upon me for a Teacher in this very Point, as if you wanted a Parishioner to instruct: and therefore I demand it of you, and shall insist upon it, till you either do it, or confess you cannot. Nor shall it excuse you to say it is *capriciously* required. For this is no otherwise *capricious*, than all Questions

stions are *capricious* to a Man that cannot answer them : and such an one I think this is to you. For if you could answer it, no body can doubt, but that you would; and that with confidence : For no body will suspect 'tis the want of that makes you so reserved. This is indeed a frequent way of answering Questions by men, that cannot otherwise cover the Absurdities of their Opinions, and their insolence of expecting to be believed upon their bare words, by saying they are *capriciously* asked, and deserved no other Answer.

But how far soever *Capriciousness* (when proved, for saying is not enough) may excuse from answering a material Question, yet your own words here will clear this from being a *capricious* Question in me. For that those Texts of Scripture, which you have set down, do not upon your own Grounds contain all the Fundamental Doctrines of Religion; all that is necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, what you say a little lower, in this very Page, as well as in other places, does demonstrate.

Your

Your words are, *I think I have sufficiently proved, that there are other Doctrines besides that [Jesus is the Messiah] which are required to be believed to make a Man a Christian; why did the Apostles write these Doctrines? was it not that those they writ to, might give their assent to them?* This Argument for the necessity of believing the Texts you cite, from their being set down in the New Testament you urged thus, p. 9. *Is this set down to no purpose in these inspired Epistles? Is it not requisite that we should know it and believe?* And again p. 29. *They are in our Bibles to that very purpose to be believed.* If then it be necessary to know, and believe those Texts of Scripture, you have collected, because the Apostles writ them, and they were not set down to no purpose. And they are in our Bibles on purpose to be believed, I have reason to demand of you other Texts, besides those you have enumerated, as containing Points necessary to be believed: because there are other Texts which the Apostles writ, and were not set down to no purpose, and are in our Bibles on purpose

pose to be believed, as well as those which you have cited.

Another reason of doubting, and consequently of demanding, whether those Propositions, you have set down for Fundamental Doctrines, be every one of them necessary to be believed, and all that are necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, I have from your next Argument which join'd to the former stands thus, *p. 22.* *Why did the Apostles write these Doctrines? Was it not that those they writ to might give their assent to them? nay, did they not require assent to them? Yes verily, for this is to be proved from the Nature of the things contained in those Doctrines which are such as had immediate respect to the Occasion, Author, Way, Means and Issue of their Redemption and Salvation.* If therefore all things which have an immediate respect to the Occasion, Author, Way, Means, and Issue of Mens Redemption and Salvation are those, and those only which are necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, may a Man not justly doubt, whether those Propositions which the *Unmasker* has set down,

down, contain all those things, and whether there be not other things contain'd in other Texts of Scripture, or in some of those cited by him, but otherwise understood, that *have as immediately a respect to the Occasion, Author, Way, Means, and Issue of Mens Redemption and Salvation*, as those he has set down? And therefore I have reason to demand a compleater List. For at best, to tell us, that *all things that have an immediate respect to the Occasion, Author, Way, Means, and Issue of Mens Redemption and Salvation*, is but a general Description of Fundamentals, with which some may think some Articles agree, and others others: And the terms *immediate respect* may give ground enough for difference about them to those, who agree, that the rest of your Description is right. My demand therefore is not a general Description of Fundamentals, but for the Reasons abovementioned, the particular Articles themselves, which are necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian.

It is not my Business at present to examine the validity of these Arguments

ments of his, to prove all the Propositions to be necessary to be believed, which he has here in his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, set down as such. The use I make of them now, is to shew the reason, they afford me to doubt, that those Propositions, which he has given us for Doctrines necessary to be believed, are either not all such, or more than all, by his own rule: And therefore I must desire him to give us a compleater Creed, that we may know, what in his sense is necessary, and enough to make a Man a Christian.

Nor will it be sufficient in this case to do, what he tells us, that he has done, in these words, p. 21. *I have briefly set before the Reader, these Evangelical Truths, Those Christian Principles which belong to the very Essence of Christianity----- and I have reduced most of them to certain Propositions, which is a thing the Vindicator called for, p. 16.* With Submission, I think, he mistakes the *Vindicator*. What I called for was, not that *most of them*, should be reduced to certain Propositions, but that all of them should: and the

the reason of my demanding that was plain, *viz.* that then having the *Unmasker's* Creed in clear and distinct Propositions, I might be able to examine, whether it was, what God in the Scriptures indispensibly required of every Man to make him a Christian, that so I might thereby correct the Errors or Defects of what I at present apprehended the Scripture taught me in the case.

The *Unmasker* endeavours to excuse himself from answering my Question by another exception against it, *p.* 24. in these words. *Surely none but this Upstart Racovian will have the confidence to deny that these Articles of Faith are such as are necessary to constitute a Christian, as to the Intellectual and Doctrinal part of Christianity, such as must IN SOME MEASURE be known and assented to by him. Not that a Man is supposed every moment to actually exert his assent and belief for none of the Moral Vertues, none of the Evangelical Graces are exerted thus always. Wherefore that Question in p. 16. (though he says he asks*

E

it

it seriously) might have been spared,
“ Whether every one of these Fun-
“ damentals is required to be believed
“ to make a Man a Christian, and
“ such as without the actual belief
“ thereof he cannot be saved ”:
Here is seriousness pretended when
there is none, for the Design is only
to Cavil, and (if he can) to expose my
Affertion. But he is not able to do it,
for all his Critical Demands are an-
swer'd in these few words, viz. That in
the Intellectual (as well as Moral En-
dowments) are never supposed to be al-
ways in act : They are exerted upon
Occasion, not all of them at a time. And
therefore he mistakes if he thinks, or
rather as he Objects without thinking,
that these Doctrines if they be Funda-
mental and Necessary, must be always
actually believed. No Man besides him-
self ever started such a thing.

This terrible long Combate has the
Unmasker managed with his own Sha-
 dow, to confound the *Seriousness* of
 my Question, and as he says himself,
 is come off not only safe and sound,
 but triumphant. But for all that, Sir,
 may not a Man's Question be *serious,*
 though

though he should chance to express it ill? I think you and I were not best to set up for Criticks in Language, and Nicety of Expression, for fear we should set the World a Laughing. Yet for this once, I shall take the liberty to defend mine here. For I demand in what Expression of mine, I said or *supposed*, that a man should *every moment* actually exert his assent to any Proposition required to be believed? Cannot a Man say, that the *Unmasker* cannot be admitted to any Preferment in the Church of *England* without an *actual assent to*, or Subscribing of the 39 Articles, unless it be *suppos'd* that he must *every moment* from the time he first read, assented to, and subscribed those Articles, till he received Institution and Induction, *actually exert his assent* to every one of them, and repeat his Subscription? In the same sense it is literally true, that a Man cannot be admitted into the Church of Christ or into Heaven, without *actually* believing all the Articles necessary to make a Man a Christian, without supposing, that he must *actually exert that assent every moment*

ment from the time, that he first gave it, till the moment that he is admitted into Heaven. He may Eat, Drink, make Bargains, study *Euclid*, and think of other things between ; nay, sometimes Sleep, and neither think of those Articles nor any thing else, and yet it be true, that he shall not be admitted into the Church, or Heaven, without an *actual assent* to them: That Condition of an *actual assent* he has perform'd, and until he recall that assent by actual Unbelief it stands good, and though a Lunacy or Lethargy should seize on him presently after, and he should never think of it again as long as he lived, yet it is literally true, he is not saved without an *actual assent*. You might therefore have spared your pains in saying, *That none of the Moral Virtues, none of the Evangelical Graces are exerted THUS always*, till you had met with some body who had said *THUS*, That I did so I think would have enter'd into no bodies thoughts but yours, it being evident from p. 298, and 300. of my Book, that by *Actual* I meant *Explicit*. You should rather have given a direct

direct Answer to my Question, which I here again *seriously* ask you, *viz.* Whether,

IX.

Those you called *Fundamental Doctrines*, in your *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*, or those *Christian Principles* which belong to the very *Essence of Christianity*, so many as you have given us of them in your *Socinianism Unmask'd* (for you may take which of your two Creeds you please) are Just those, neither more nor less, that are every one of them required to be believed to make a Man a Christian, and such, as without the actual or (since that word displeases you) the explicit belief whereof he cannot be saved.

When you have answer'd this Question, we shall then see which of us two is nearest the right? But if you shall forbear Railing, which I fear you take for arguing, against that Summary of Faith, which our Saviour

and his Apostles taught, and which only they propos'd to their Hearers to be believed to make them Christians, till you have found another perfect Creed of only necessary Articles, that you dare own for such; you are like to have a large time of Silence. Before I leave the Passage above cited, I must desire the Reader to take notice of what he says concerning his List of Fundamentals, *viz.* That *these his Articles of Faith necessary to constitute a Christian, are such as must IN SOME MEASURE be known and assented to by him.* A very wary Expression concerning Fundamentals. The Question is about Articles necessary to be explicitly believed to make a Man a Christian. These in his List the *Unmasker* tells us are *necessary to constitute a Christian, and must IN SOME MEASURE be known and assented to*, I would now fain know of the Reader whether he understands hereby, that the *Unmasker* means, that these his necessary Articles must be explicitly believed or not! If he means an explicit Knowledge and Belief, why does he puzzle his Reader by so
impro-

Improper a way of speaking? for what is as compleat and perfect as it ought to be, cannot properly be said to be *in some Measure*. If his *in some Measure* falls short of explicitly knowing and believing his Fundamentals, his necessary Articles are such as a Man may be a Christian without explicitly knowing and believing, *i. e.* are no Fundamentals, no necessary Articles at all. Thus Men, uncertain what to say, betray themselves by their great Caution.

Having pronounced it *Folly* in himself to make up the defects of my short, and therefore so much blam'd Collection of Fundamentals, by a full one of his own, though his Attempt shews he would if he could, he goes on thus, *p. 22.* *From what I [the Unmasker] have said it is evident, that the Vindicator is grossly mistaken when he saith, " Whatever Doctrine the Apostles required to be believed to make a Man a Christian, are to be found in those places of Scripture which he has quoted in his Book".* And a little lower, *I think I have sufficiently proved that there are other Do-*

A Second Vindication of the

ctrines besides that, which are required to be believed to make a Man a Christian. *Answ.* Whatever you have proved, or (as you never fail to do) boast you have proved, will signifie nothing till you have proved one of these Propositions, and have shewn either,

X.

That what our Saviour and his Apostles preach'd and admitted Men into the Church for believing, is not all that is absolutely required to make a Man a Christian. Or,

That the believing him to be the *Messiah*, was not the only Article they insisted on to those, who acknowledg'd one God; and upon the belief whereof they admitted Converts into the Church, in any one of those many places quoted by me out of the History of the New Testament.

I say, *any one*; For though it be evident throughout the whole Gospel and the *Acts*, that this was the one
Doctrine

Doctrine of Faith, which in all their Preachings every where, they principally drive at : Yet if it were not so, but that in other places they taught other things, that would not prove, that those other things were Articles of Faith absolutely necessarily required to be believed to make a Man a Christian, unless it had been so said. Because if it appears, that ever any one was admitted into the Church by our Saviour or his Apostles, without having that Article explicitly laid before him, and without his explicit assent to it, you must grant, that an explicit assent to that Article is not necessary to make a Man a Christian : Unless you will say, that our Saviour, and his Apostles admitted Men into the Church, that were not qualified with such a Faith, as was absolutely necessary to make a Man a Christian, which is as much as to say, that they allow'd, and pronounced Men to be Christians, who were not Christians. For he, that wants what is necessary to make a Man a Christian, can no more be a Christian, than he, that wants what is necessary to make him a Man, can be

be a Man. For what is necessary to the being of any thing is Essential to its being; and any thing may be as well without its Essence, as without any thing that is necessary to its being: and so a Man be a Man without being a Man, and a Christian a Christian without being a Christian; and an Unmasker may prove this, without proving it. You may therefore set up, by your unquestionable Authority, what Articles you please, as necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian; If our Saviour, and his Apostles admitted Converts into the Church without preaching those your Articles to them; or requiring an Explicit assent to what they did not Preach, and explicitly lay down, I shall prefer their Authority to yours; and think it was rather by them, than by you, that God promulgated the Law of Faith; and manifested, what that Faith was, upon which he would receive penitent Converts.

And though by his Apostles our Saviour taught a great many other Truths, for the explaining this Fundamental Article of the Law of Faith,
that

that Jesus is the Messiah ; some where-
of have a nearer, and some a more
remote connexion with it , and so
cannot be deny'd by any Christian,
who sees that connexion, or knows
they are so taught : yet an explicit
belief of any one of them is no more
necessarily required to make a Man a
Christian, than an explicit belief of
all those Truths which have a con-
nexion with the being of a God, or
are reveal'd by him, is necessarily re-
quired to make a Man not to be an
Atheist : Though none of them can
be denied by any one, who sees that
connexion, or acknowledges that re-
velation, without his being an Atheist.
All these Truths taught us from God,
either by Reason, or Revelation, are
of great use, to enlighten our Minds,
confirm our Faith, stir up our Affe-
ctions, &c. And the more we see of
them, the more we shall see, admire,
and magnifie the Wisdom, Goodness,
Mercy, and Love of God in the Work
of our Redemption. This will ob-
lige us to search, and study the Scrip-
ture, wherein it is contain'd and laid
open to us.

All

All that we find in the Revelation of the New Testament, being the declar'd Will and Mind of our Lord and Master the *Messiah*, whom we have taken to be our King, we are bound to receive as Right and Truth, or else we are not his Subjects, we do not believe him to be the *Messiah* our King, but cast him off, and with the *Jews* say, we will not have this Man reign over us. But it is still what we find in the Scripture, not in this or that System; what we sincerely seeking to know the Will of our Lord, discover to be his Mind. Where it is spoken plainly we cannot miss it, and it is evident, he requires our assent: where there is obscurity either in the Expressions themselves, or by reason of the seeming contrariety of other Passages, there a fair endeavour, as much as our Circumstances will permit, secures us from a guilty Disobedience to his Will, or a sinful Error in Faith, which way soever our enquiry resolves the doubt, or perhaps leaves it unresolved. If he had required more of us in those Points, he would have declared his Will plainer to us;
and

and discover'd the Truth contain'd in those obscure, or seemingly contradictory places, as clearly, and as uniformly as he did that Fundamental Article, that we were to believe him to be the *Messiah* our King.

As Men we have God for our King, and are under the Law of Reason: As Christians, we have *Jesus* the *Messiah* for our King, and are under the Law revealed by him in the Gospel. . And though every Christian, both as a *Deist* and a *Christian*, be obliged to study both the Law of Nature and the Revealed Law, that in them he may know the Will of God, and of *Jesus* Christ whom he hath sent, yet in neither of these Laws is there to be found a Select Set of Fundamentals, distinct from the rest which are to make him, a *Deist* or a *Christian*. But he that believes one Eternal invisible God, his Lord and King, ceases thereby to be an Atheist; and he that believes *Jesus* to be the *Messiah* his King, ordain'd by God thereby becomes a Christian, is delivered from the Power of Darkness, and is Translated into the Kingdom of the Son of God, is actually

ally within the Covenant of Grace, and has that Faith; which shall be imputed to him for Righteousness, and if he continues in his Allegiance to this his King, shall receive the reward, Eternal Life.

He that Considers this, will not be so hot as the *Unmasker*, to contend for a Number of Fundamental Articles all necessary every one of them to be explicitly believed, by every one, for Salvation, without knowing them himself, or being able to enumerate them to another. Can there be any thing more absurd, than to say, there are several Fundamental Articles, each of which every Man must explicitly believe upon pain of Damnation, and yet not to be able to say, which they be? The *Unmasker* has set down no small Number; but yet dares not say, these are all. On the contrary, he has plainly confessed, there are more: but will not, *i.e.* cannot tell what they are, that remain behind. Nay, has given a general Description of his Fundamental Articles, by which it is not evident, but there may be ten times as many, as those he had named; and

and amongst them (if he durst or could name them) probably several, that many a good Christian, who died in the Faith, and is now in Heaven, never once thought of; and others, which many, of as good Authority as he, would from their different Systems, certainly deny and contradict.

This, as great an Absurdity as it is, cannot be otherwise, whilst Men will take upon them to alter the terms of the Gospel; and when it is evident, that our Saviour, and his Apostles received Men into the Church, and pronounced them Believers, for taking him to be the *Messiah* their King and Deliverer sent by God, have the boldness to say, this is not enough. But when you would know of them what then is enough, they cannot tell you. The reason whereof is visible, *viz.* Because they being able to produce no other reason for their Collection of Fundamental Articles to prove them necessary to be believed, but because they are of Divine Authority and contain'd in the Holy Scriptures, and are, as the *Unmasker* says, *writ there*

on purpose to be believed, they know not where to stop, when they have once begun. Those Texts that they leave out, or from which they deduce none of them, being of the same Divine Authority, and so upon that Account equally Fundamental, with what they have culled out, though not so well suited to their particular Systems.

Hence come those endless and unreasonable Contentions about Fundamentals, whilst each censures the Defect, Redundancy, or Falshood of what others require, as necessary to be believed; and yet he himself gives not a Catalogue of his own Fundamentals, which he will say is sufficient and compleat. Nor is it to be wondred, since in this way it is impossible to stop short of putting every Proposition divinely revealed into the List of Fundamentals; all of them being of Divine, and so of equal Authority, and upon that account equally necessary to be believed by every one who is a Christian; though they are not all necessary to be believed to make any one a Christian. For the New Testament, containing the Laws of the *Messiah's* Kingdom

dom, in regard of all the Actions both of Mind and Body of all his Subjects, every Christian is bound by his Allegiance to him, to believe all that he says in it to be true, as well as to assent, that all that he commands in it is just and good: And what Negligence, Perverseness, or Guilt there is in his mistaking in the one, or failing in his obedience to the other, That this Righteous Judge of all Men, who cannot be deceived, will at the last day lay open, and reward accordingly.

'Tis no wonder therefore, there has been such fierce Contests, and such cruel Havock made amongst Christians about Fundamentals: Whilst every one would set up his System upon pain of Fire and Faggot in this, and Hell Fire in the other World; Though at the same time, whilst he is exercising the utmost Barbarities against others to prove himself a true Christian, he professes himself so ignorant that he cannot tell, or so uncharitable, that he will not tell, what Articles are absolutely necessary, and sufficient to make a Man a Christian. If there be any such Fundamentals, as 'tis cer-

F

tain

tain there are, 'tis as certain they must be very plain. Why then does every one urge and make a stir about Fundamentals, and no body give a List of them? But because, (as I have said) upon the usual Grounds, they cannot. For I will be bold to say, that every one, who considers the matter, will see, that either only the Article of his being the *Messiah* their King, which alone our Saviour and his Apostles preach'd to the Unconverted World, and received those that believed it into the Church, is the only necessary Article to be believed by a *Theist* to make him a Christian; Or else that all the Truths contain'd in the New Testament, are necessary Articles to be believed to make a Man a Christian; And that between these two it is impossible any where to stand. The reason whereof is plain. Because either the believing *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, *i. e.* the taking him to be our King, makes us Subjects and Denizens of his Kingdom, *i. e.* Christians; Or else an explicit knowledge of, and actual Obedience to the Laws of his Kingdom is what is required

to make us Subjects; Which, I think, is what was never said of any other Kingdom. For a Man must be a Subject before he is bound to obey.

Let us suppose it will be said here, that an Obedience to the Laws of Christ's Kingdom, is what is necessary to make us Subjects of it, without which we cannot be admitted into it, *i.e.* be Christians: And if so, this Obedience must be Universal; I mean, it must be the same sort of Obedience to all the Laws of this Kingdom: Which since no body says is in any one such as is wholly free from Error or Frailty, this Obedience can only lie in a sincere disposition and purpose of Mind to obey every one of the Laws of the *Messiah* deliver'd in the New Testament, to the utmost of our Power. Now believing right being one part of that Obedience, as well as acting right is the other part, the Obedience of assent must be implicitly to all that is deliver'd there; That it is true. But for as much as the particular acts of an explicit assent cannot go any farther than his understanding, who is to assent, What he understands to

be the Truth deliver'd by our Saviour, or the Apostles commission'd by him, and assisted by his Spirit, That he must necessarily believe: It becomes a Fundamental Article to him, and he cannot refuse his assent to it, without renouncing his Allegiance. For he that denies any of the Doctrines that Christ has deliver'd, to be true, denies him to be sent from God, and consequently to be the *Messiah*, and so ceases to be a Christian. From whence it is evident, that if any more be necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, than the believing *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, and thereby taking him for our King; It cannot be any set bundle of Fundamentals culled out of the Scripture, with an omission of the rest, according as best suits any ones Fancy, System, or Interest: But it must be an explicit belief of all those Propositions, which he according to the best of his understanding, really apprehends to be contain'd, and meant in the Scripture; and an implicit belief of all the rest, which he is ready to believe, as soon as it shall please God, upon his use of the means, to enlighten

enlighten him, and make them clear to his understanding. So that in effect, almost every particular Man in this sense has, or may have, a distinct Catalogue of Fundamentals, each whereof it is necessary for him explicitly to believe, now that he is a Christian; whereof if he should disbelieve, or deny any one, he would cast off his Allegiance, disfranchise himself, and be no longer a Subject of Christ's Kingdom. But in this sense no body can tell what is Fundamental to another, what is necessary for another Man to believe. This Catalogue of Fundamentals every one alone can make for himself: No body can fix it for him; no body can collect or prescribe it to another: But this is according as God has dealt to every one the measure of Light and Faith; and hath open'd each Man's Understanding, that he may understand the Scriptures. Whoever has used what means he is capable of, for the informing of himself, with a readiness to believe and obey what shall be taught and prescrib'd by *Jesus* his Lord and King, is a true and faithful Subject of *Christ's*

Kingdom; and cannot be thought to fail in any thing necessary to Salvation.

Supposing a Man and his Wife, barely by seeing the wonderful things that *Moses* did, should have been persuaded to put themselves under his Government; Or by reading his Law, and liking it; or by any other Motive, had been prevail'd on sincerely to take him for their Ruler and Law-giver, and accordingly (renouncing their former Idolatry and Heathenish Pollutions) in token thereof had by Baptism and Circumcision, the initiating Ceremonies, solemnly enter'd themselves into that Communion under the Law of *Moses*; had they not thereby been made Denizens of the Commonwealth of *Israel*, and invested with all the Privileges and Prerogatives of true Children of *Abraham*, leaving to their Posterity a right to their share in the Promis'd Land, though they had died before they had performed any other Act of Obedience to that Law; nay, though they had not known whose Son *Moses* was, nor how he had deliver'd the Children
of

of *Israel* out of *Egypt*, nor whither he was leading them? I do not say it is likely they should be so far ignorant: But whether they were or no, 'twas enough, that they took him for their Prince and Ruler, with a purpose to obey him, to submit themselves entirely to his Commands and Conduct; And did nothing afterwards, whereby they disowned or rejected his Authority over them. In that respect, none of his Laws were greater, or more necessary to be submitted to one than another, though the matter of one might be of much greater Consequence than of another. But a Disobedience to any Law of the least Consequence, if it carry with it a disowning of the Authority that made it, forfeits all, and cuts off such an Offender from that Commonwealth, and all the Privileges of it.

This is the case, in respect of other Matters of Faith, to those who believe *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, and take him to be their King sent from God, and so are already *Christians*. 'Tis not the opinion, that any one may have of the weightiness of the Matter, (if they

are, without their own fault ignorant that our Saviour hath revealed it) that shall disfranchise them, and make them forfeit their Interest in his Kingdom: they may be still good Subjects, though they do not believe a great many things, which Creed-makers may think necessary to be believed. That which is required of them is a sincere endeavour to know his Mind declared in the Gospel, and an explicit belief of all that they understand to be so. Not to believe what he has reveal'd, whether in a lighter or more weighty Matter, calls his veracity into Question, destroys his Mission, denies his Authority, and is a flat disowning him to be the *Messiah*; And so overturns that Fundamental, and Necessary Article whereby a Man is a Christian. But this cannot be done by a Man's Ignorance, or unwilful Mistake of any of the Truths published by our Saviour himself, or his authorized and inspired Ministers in the New Testament. Whilst a Man knows not that it was his Will or Meaning, his Allegiance is safe, though he believe the contrary.

If

If this were not so, it is impossible, that any one should be a Christian. For in some things we are ignorant, and err all, not knowing the Scriptures. For the holy inspired Writings, being all of the same Divine Authority, must all equally in every Article be Fundamental and necessary to be believed; if that be a reason, that makes any one Proposition in it necessary to be believed. But the Law of Faith, the Covenant of the Gospel, being a Covenant of Grace, and not of Natural Right or Debt, nothing can be absolutely necessary to be believed, but what by this new Law of Faith God of his good pleasure hath made to be so. And this 'tis plain by the preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles, to all that believed not already in him, was only the believing the only true God, and *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, whom he hath sent. The performance of this puts a Man within the Covenant, and is that which God will impute to him for Righteousness. All the other acts of assent to other Truths, taught by our Saviour, and his Apostles, are not what make a Man
a Chri-

a Christian; but are necessary acts of Obedience to be performed by one, who is a Christian; and therefore being a Christian, ought to live by the Laws of Christ's Kingdom.

Nor are we without some glimpse of Light, why it hath pleased God of his Grace, that the believing *Jesus* to be the *Messiah* should be that Faith which he would impute to Men for Righteousness. 'Tis evident from the Scripture, that our Saviour despised the Shame and endured the Cross for the Joy that was set before him; Which joy, 'tis also plain, was a Kingdom. But in this Kingdom which his Father had appointed to him, he could have none but voluntary Subjects, such as leaving the Kingdom of Darkness, and of the Prince of this World, with all the Pleasures, Poms and Vanities thereof, would put themselves under his Dominion, and translate themselves into his Kingdom; which they did by believing and owning him to be the *Messiah* their King, and thereby taking him to rule over them. For the Faith for which God justifieth, is not an empty Speculation, but a
Faith

Faith joyn'd with Repentance, and working by Love. And for this, which was in effect to return to God himself, and to their natural Allegiance due to him; and advance as much as lay in them the Glory of the Kingdom, which he had promised his Son, God was pleased to declare he would accept them, receive them to Grace, and blot out all their former Transgressions.

This is evidently the Covenant of Grace as deliver'd in the Scriptures: And if this be not, I desire any one to tell me what it is, and what are the terms of it. 'Tis a Law of Faith, whereby God has promised to forgive all our Sins upon our Repentance, and believing something; and to impute that Faith to us for Righteousness. Now I ask what 'tis by the Law of Faith we are required to believe? for till that be known, the Law of Faith is not distinctly known, nor the terms of the Covenant upon which the Almerciful God graciously offers us Salvation. And if any one will say this is not known, nay, is not easily, and certainly to be known under the Gospel,

spel, I desire him to tell me what the greatest Enemies of Christianity can say worse against it? For a way propos'd to Salvation, that does not certainly lead thither, or is propos'd so as not to be known, are very little different as to their consequence; and Mankind would be left to wander in darkness and uncertainty with the one as well as the other.

I do not write this for Controversies sake; for had I minded Victory, I would not have given the *Unmasker* this new Matter of exception. I know whatever is said, he must be bawling for his fashionable and profitable Orthodoxy, and cry out against this too which I have here added, as *Socinianism*, and cast that Name upon all that differs from what is held by those, he would recommend his Zeal to in Writing. I call it *bawling*, for whether what he has said be Reasoning, I shall referr to those of his own Brotherhood, if he be of any Brotherhood, and there be any that will joyn with him in his Set of Fundamentals, when his Creed is made.

Had

Had I minded nothing but how to deal with him, I had tied him up short to his List of Fundamentals, without affording him Topicks of declaiming against what I have here said. But I have enlarged on this point, for the sake of such Readers, who with a love of truth read Books of this kind, and endeavour to inform themselves in the things of their everlasting concernment: It being of greater consideration with me, to give any light and satisfaction to one single Person, who is really concerned to understand, and be convinced of the Religion he professes, than what a Thousand fashionable or titular Professors of any sort of Orthodoxy shall say or think of me, for not doing as they do, *i.e.* for not saying after others, without understanding what is said, or upon what Grounds; or caring to understand it.

Let us now consider his Argument, to prove the Articles he has given us to be Fundamentals. In his *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*, p. 119. he argues from 1 *Tim.* iii. 16. where, he says, *Christianity is called a Mystery,*
that

that *all things in Christianity are not plain, and exactly level to every common apprehension; that every thing in Christianity is not clear, and intelligible and comprehensible by the weakest Noddle.* Let us take this for proved, as much as he pleases, and then let us see the force of this subtle Disputant's Argument, for the necessity there is, that every Christian Man should believe those, which he has given us for Fundamental Articles out of the Epistles. The Reason of that Obligation, and the Necessity of every Man and Woman's believing them, he has laid in this, that they are to be found in the *Epistles*, or in the *Bible*. This Argument for them we have over and over again in his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, as here, p. 9. thus; *Are they set down to no purpose in these inspired Epistles. Why did the Apostles write these Doctrines, was it not, that those they writ to, might give their assent to them?* P. 22. *They are in our Bibles for that very purpose to be believed.* p. 25. Now I ask, can any one more directly invalidate all he says here for the necessity of believing his Articles?

Can

Can any one more apparently write booty than by saying that *these his Doctrines, these his Fundamental Articles* (which are after his fashion set down between the 8. and 20. Pages of this his First Chapter) are of necessity to be believed by every one, before he can be a Christian, because they are in the *Epistles* and in the *Bible*; and yet to affirm that in Christianity, *i.e.* in the *Epistles* and in the *Bible* there are *Mysteries*, there are things *not plain, not clear, not intelligible to common apprehensions*. If his Articles, some of which contain Mysteries, are necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, because they are in the *Bible*; than according to this rule it is necessary for many Men to believe, what is not *intelligible* to them; what their *Noddles* cannot apprehend (as the *Unmasker* is pleased to turn the Supposition of vulgar Peoples understanding the Fundamentals of their Religion into ridicule) *i.e.* it is necessary for many Men to do, what is impossible for them to do, before they can be Christians. But if there be several things

things in the Bible, and in the Epistles, that it is not necessary for Men to believe to make them Christians; then all the *Unmasker's* Arguments from their being in the *Epistles* is no Proof, that all his Articles are necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, because they are set down in the Epistles; much less, because he thinks they may be drawn according to his System out of what is set down in the Epistles. Let him therefore either confess these and the like Questions, *Why did the Apostles write these? was it not that those they writ to, might give their assent to them? Why should not every one of these Evangelical Truths be believed and imbraced? They are in our Bibles for that very purpose, and the like, to be impertinent and ridiculous:* Let him cease to propose them with so much ostentation, for they can serve only to mislead unwary Readers: Or let him unsay what he has said of things *not plain to common apprehensions, not clear and intelligible.* Let him recant what he has said of *Mysteries* in Christianity. For I ask with him, *p. 8. where can*

we be informed but in the sacred and inspired writings? It is ridiculous to urge, that any thing is necessary to be explicitly believed to make a Man a Christian, because it is writ in the *Epistles* and in the *Bible*; Unless he confess that there is no *Mystery*, no thing not *plain* not *intelligible* to *Vulgar* understanding, in the *Epistles* or in the *Bible*.

This is so evident, that the *Unmasker* himself, who *p. 119.* of his *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*, thought it ridiculous to suppose, that the *Vulgar* should understand Christianity, is here of another Mind: And, *p. 30.* says of his *Evangelical Doctrines and Articles* necessary to be assented to, that they are *intelligible* and *plain*; There is no *Ambiguity* and *Doubtfulness* in them; They shine with their own light, and to an unprejudiced eye are plain, evident and illustrious.

To draw the *Unmasker* out of the Clouds, and prevent his hiding himself in the doubtfulness of his Expressions, I shall desire him to say directly, whether the Articles, which are ne-

G cessary

cessary to be believed, to make a Man a Christian, and particularly those he has set down for such, are all plain and intelligible, and such as may be understood and comprehended (I will not say in the *Unmasker's* ridiculous way, by *the weakest Noddles*, but) by every illiterate Countryman and Woman capable of Church Communion?

If he says yes; Then all Mysteries are excluded out of his Articles necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian. For that which can be comprehended by every Day-Labourer, every poor Spinster, that is a Member of the Church, cannot be a Mystery. And if what such illiterate People cannot understand, be required to be believed to make them Christians, the greatest part of Mankind are shut out from being Christians.

But the *Unmasker* has provided an Answer in these words, p. 31. *There is, says he, a difficulty in the Doctrine of the Trinity, and several Truths of the Gospel, as to the exact manner of the things themselves, which we shall never be able*

to comprehend, at least on this side of Heaven: But there is no difficulty as to the reality and certainty of them, because we know they are revealed to us by God in the Holy Scripture.

Which Answer of difficulty in the manner, and no difficulty in the reality, having the appearance of a distinction, looks like Learning; but when it comes to be applied to the case in hand will scarce afford us sense.

The Question is about a Proposition to be believed, which must first necessarily be understood. For a Man cannot possibly give his assent to any Affirmation or Negation, unless he understand the terms as they are joyn'd in that Proposition, and has a Conception of the thing affirm'd or deny'd, and also a Conception of the thing concerning which it is affirm'd or deny'd as they are there put together. But let the Proposition be what it will, there is no more to be understood than is expressed in the terms of that Proposition. If it be a Proposition concerning a Matter of Fact, 'tis enough to conceive, and believe the Matter of Fact. If it be a Propo-

sition concerning the manner of the Fact, the manner of the Fact must also be believed, as it is intelligibly expressed in that Proposition, v. g. should this Proposition *οὗτος ὁ νεκρὸς ἐγείρεται* be offer'd as an Article of Faith to an illiterate Countryman of *England*, he could not believe it: Because, though a true Proposition, yet it being propos'd in words whose meaning he understood not, he could not give any assent to it. Put it into English, he understands what is meant by the *Dead shall rise*. For he can conceive, that the same Man, who was dead and senseless, should be alive again; As well as he can, that the same Man, who is now in a Lethargy, should awake again; or the same Man that now is out of his sight, and he knows not whether he be alive or dead, should return, and be with him again: And so he is capable of believing it, though he conceives nothing of the manner how a Man revives, wakes, or moves. But none of these manners of those actions being included in those Propositions, the Proposition concerning the Matter of Fact (if it imply no contra-

contradiction in it) may be believed; and so all that is required may be done, whatever difficulty may be *as to the* exact manner how it is brought about.

But where the Proposition is about the manner, the belief too must be of the manner. *v. g.* The Article is, *The Dead shall be raised with spiritual Bodies.* And then the belief must be as well of this manner of the Fact, as of the Fact it self. So that what is said here by the *Unmasker* about the *manner* signifies nothing at all in the case. What is understood to be expressed in each Proposition, whether it be of the manner, or not of the manner, is (by its being a Revelation from God) to be believed, as far as it is understood: But no more is required to be believed concerning any Article, than is contain'd in that Article.

What the *Unmasker*, for the removing of Difficulties, adds farther in these words, *But there is no difficulty as to the reality and certainty of the truths of the Gospel. Because we know, they are revealed to us by God in the*

Holy Scripture, is yet farther from signifying any thing to the purpose, than the former. The Question is about understanding ; And, in what sense they are understood, believing several Propositions, or Articles of Faith, which are to be found in the Scripture. To this, the *Unmasker* says, there can be *no difficulty* at all *as to their reality and certainty ; because they are revealed by God*. Which amounts to no more but this, That there is no difficulty at all in understanding and believing this Proposition, *that whatever is revealed by God is really and certainly true*. But is the understanding and believing this single Proposition, the understanding and believing all the Articles of Faith necessary to be believed ? Is this all the explicit Faith a Christian need have ? If so, then a Christian need explicitly believe no more but this one Proposition, *viz.* That all the Propositions between the two Covers of his Bible are certainly true. But I imagine the *Unmasker* will not think the believing this one Proposition is a sufficient belief of all those Fundamental Articles, which

which he has given us as necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian. For if that will serve the turn, I conclude he may make his Set of Fundamentals as large and express to his System as he pleases; *Calvinists, Arminians, Anabaptists, Socinians*, will all thus own the belief of them; *viz.* That all that God has revealed in the Scripture is really and certainly true.

But if believing this Proposition, that all that is reveal'd by God in the Scripture is true, be not all the Faith which the *Unmasker* requires, what he says about the *reality* and *certainity* of all Truths reveal'd by God removes nothing of the difficulty. A Proposition of Divine Authority is found in the Scripture: 'tis agreed presently between him and me, that it contains a *real certain* truth: But the difficulty is, what is the Truth it contains, to which he, and I must assent. *v. g.* The Profession of Faith made by the Eunuch in these words, *Jesus Christ is the Son of God*, upon which he was admitted into the Church as a Christian, I believe contains a *real and cer-*

tain Truth. Is that enough? no says the *Unmasker*, p. 87. it *includes in it that Christ was God*; and therefore it is not enough for me to believe, that these words contain a *real certain* truth; But I must believe they contain this truth, that Jesus Christ is God; That the Eunuch spoke them in that sense, and in that sense I must assent to them: Whereas they appear to me to be spoken, and meant here, as well as in several other places of the New Testament, in this sense, *viz. That Jesus Christ is the Messiah*, and in that sense in this place I assent to them. The meaning then of these words as spoken by the Eunuch is the difficulty: And I desire the *Unmasker*, by the Application of what he has said here, to remove that difficulty. For granting all Revelation from God to be *really and certainly* true (as certainly it is) how does the believing that general truth remove any difficulty about the sense and interpretation of any particular Proposition found in any passage of the Holy Scriptures? Or is it possible for any Man to understand it in one sense, and believe it in another; because it
is

is a Divine Revelation, that has *reallity* and *certainity* in it? Thus much as to what the *Unmasker* says of the Fundamentals he has given us, p. 30. *viz.* That *No true Lover of God and Truth need doubt of any of them : For there is no ambiguity and doubtfulness in them.* If the distinction he has used of *difficulty as to the exact manner, and difficulty as to the reality and certainty of Gospel Truths,* will remove all *ambiguity and doubtfulness* from all those Texts of Scripture, from whence he and others deduce Fundamental Articles, so that they will be *plain and intelligible* to every Man in the sense he understands them, he has done great Service to Christianity.

But he seems to distrust that himself, in the following words. *They shine,* says he, *with their own light, and to an unprejudiced eye are plain evident and illustrious, and they would always continue so, if some ill minded Men did not perplex and entangle them.* I see the Matter would go very smooth, if the *Unmasker* might be the sole authentick Interpreter of Scripture. He is wisely of that Judge's Mind, who
was

was against hearing the Counsel on the other side, because they always *perplexed* the Cause.

But if those who differ from the *Unmasker*, shall in their turns call him the *Prejudiced* and *Ill-minded Man*, who *perplexes* these Matters (as they may with as much Authority as he) we are but where we were; Each must understand for himself the best he can; till the *Unmasker* be received as the only *unprejudiced* Man, to whose Dictates every one without Examination is with an implicit Faith to submit.

Here again, p. 32. The *Unmasker* puts upon me, what I never said, and therefore I must desire him to shew, where it is, that I pretend,

XI.

That this *Proposition*, that Jesus is the Messiah, is more intelligible than any of those he has named.

In his *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*, p. 120. he argues that this Proposition [*Jesus is the Messiah*] has

has more difficulty in it than the Article of the Holy Trinity. And his Proofs are worthy of an *Unmasker*. For, says he, *Here is an Hebrew word first to be explain'd*, or (as he has this strong Argument again, *Socinianism Unmask'd*, p. 32.) *Here first the Name Jesus, which is of Hebrew extraction, though since Grecized must be expounded*.

Ans. *Jesus* being a proper Name, only denoting a certain Person, needs not to be expounded, of what *extraction* soever it be. Is this Proposition, *Jonathan* was the Son of *Saul* King of *Israel*, any thing the harder, because the three proper Names in it, *Jonathan*, *Saul* and *Israel* are of *Hebrew extraction*? And is it not as easie and as level to the understanding of the *Vulgar* as this, *Arthur* was the Son of *Henry* King of *England*, though neither of these Names be of *Hebrew extraction*? Or cannot any *Vulgar Capacity* understand this Proposition, *John Edwards* writ a Book, Intituled, *Socinianism Unmask'd*, till the Name *John*, which is of *Hebrew extraction*, be explained to him? If this be so, Parents were best

best beware how hereafter they give their Children Scripture Names, if they cannot understand what they say to one another about them, till these Names of *Hebrew extraction* are expounded to them; And every Proposition, that is in Writings and Contracts made concerning Persons, that have Names of *Hebrew extractions*, become thereby as hard to be understood as the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

His next Argument is just of the same size. The word *Messias* must, he says, be explained too. Of what Extraction soever it be, there needs no more Explication of it than what our English Bible gives of it, where it is plain to any *vulgar capacity*, that it was used to denote that King and Deliverer whom God had promised. So that this Proposition, *Jesus is the Messiah*, has no more difficulty in it, than this, *Jesus is the promised King and Deliverer*; Or than this, *Cyrus was King and Deliverer of Persia*: Which I think requires not much depth of *Hebrew* to be understood. He that understood this Proposition, and took *Cyrus* for

for his King, was a Subject and a Member of his Kingdom; And he that understands the other, and takes *Jesus* to be his King, is his Subject and a Member of his Kingdom. But if this be as hard as it is to some Men to understand the Doctrine of the Trinity, I fear many of the Kings in the World have but few true Subjects. To believe *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, is (as he has been told over and over again) to take him for our King and Ruler, promised and sent by God. This is that, which will make any one from a *Jew* or *Heathen* to be a *Christian*. In this sense it is very intelligible to *vulgar Capacities*. Those who so understand and believe it, are so far from pronouncing those words as a spell (as the *Unmasker* ridiculously suggests, p. 33.) that they thereby become Christians.

But what if I tell the *Unmasker*, that there is one Mr. *Edwards*, who (when he speaks his Mind, without considering how it will make for or against him) in another place, thinks this Proposition, *Jesus is the Messiah*, very easie and intelligible? To convince

vince him of it, I shall desire him to turn to the 74th. Page of his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, where he will find that Mr. Edwards without any great search into Hebrew Extractions, interprets *Jesus the Messiah* to signifie this, *That Jesus of Nazareth was that eminent and extraordinary Person prophefied of long before, and that he was sent and commissioned by God* : Which I think is no very hard Proposition to be understood. But it is no strange thing, that that which was very easie to an *Unmasker* in one place, should be terrible hard in another; where want of something better requires to have it so.

Another Argument that he uses to prove the Articles he has given us to be necessary to Salvation, (p. 22.) is because they are Doctrines which contain things that in their Nature have an *immediate respect to the Occasion, Author, Way, End, Means and Issue of Mens Redemption and Salvation*. And here I desire him to prove,

XII.

That every one of his Articles contains things so immediately relating to the *Occasion, Author, Way, Means and Issue of our Redemption and Salvation*, that no body can be saved without understanding the Texts from whence he draws them, in the very same sense that he does; And explicitly believing all these Propositions that he has deduced, and all that he will deduce from Scripture, when he shall please to compleat his Creed.

Pag. 23. He says of his Fundamentals, *not without good reason THEREFORE I called them Essential and Integral parts of our Christian and Evangelical Faith: And why the Vindicator fleers at these terms, p. 18. I know no reason, but that he cannot confute the Application of them.*

Answ. One would think by the word *therefore*, which he uses here, that in the precedent Paragraph, he had

had produced some reason to justify his ridiculous use of those terms in his *Thoughts concerning Atheism*, p. 111. But nothing therein will be found tending to it. Indeed the foregoing Paragraph begins with these words, *Thus I have briefly set before the Reader those Evangelical Truths, those Christian Principles, which belong to the very essence of Christianity.* Amongst these there is the word *Essence* : But that from thence, or any thing else in that Paragraph, the *Unmasker* could with good sense, or any sense at all, infer as he does, *not without good reason, THEREFORE, I called them the ESSENTIAL and INTEGRAL parts of our Christian and Evangelical Faith*, requires an extraordinary sort of Logick to make out. What, I beseech you, is your *good reason* too here, upon which you infer *Therefore, &c?* For it is impossible for any one but an *Unmasker*, to find one word justifying his use of the terms *Essential* and *Integral*. But it would be a great restraint to the running of the *Unmasker's* Pen, if you should not allow him the free use of illative Particles.

ticles, where there are no Promises to support them : And if you should not take Affirmations without Proof for reasoning, you at once strike off above three quarters of his Book ; and he will often, for several Pages together, have nothing to say. As for Example, from p. 28. to p. 35.

But to shew, that I did not without reason say his use of the terms *Essential* and *Integral*, in the place before quoted, was ridiculous, I must mind my Reader, that pag. 109. of his *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*, he having said that *the Epistolary Writings are fraught with other Fundamentals besides that one which I mention*, and then having set them down, he closes his Catalogue of them thus : *These are Matters of Faith contain'd in the Epistles, and they are Essential and Integral parts of the Gospel it self*, p. 111. Now what could be more ridiculous, than where the question is about Fundamental Doctrines, which are the *Essentials* of Christian Religion, without an assent to which a Man cannot be a Christian, and so he himself calls them, p. 21. of his

A Second Vindication of the

Socinianism Unmask'd, that he should close the List he had made of *Fundamental Doctrines*, i. e. *Essential Points* of the Christian Religion, with telling his Reader, *These are Essential and Integral parts of the Gospel it self?* i. e. these which I have given you for *Fundamental*, for *Essential Doctrines* of the Gospel are the *Fundamental* and not *Fundamental*, *Essential* and not *Essential* parts of the Gospel mixed together. For *integral* parts, in all the Writers I have met with, besides the *Unmasker*, are contra-distinguished to *Essential*; and signifie such parts as the thing can be without, but without them will not be so compleat and entire as with them. Just such an acuteness as our *Unmasker* would any one shew, who taking upon him to set down the parts *Essential* to a Man, without the having of which he could not be a Man, should name the Soul, the Head, the Heart, Lungs, Stomach, Liver, Spleen, Eyes, Ears, Tongue, Arms, Legs, Hair and Nails; and to make all sure, should conclude with these words, *these are Parts contain'd in a Man, and are Essential and Integral*

gral Parts of a Man himself, i. e. they are Parts, some without which he cannot be a Man, and others which though they make the Man entire, yet he may be a Man without them; As a Man ceases not to be a Man, though he want a Nail, a Finger, or an Arm, which are *Integral Parts* of a Man. *Risum teneatis?* If the *Unmasker* can make any better sence of his *Essential and Integral Parts of the Gospel it self*; I will ask his Pardon for my Laughing: Till then he must not be angry, if the Reader and I laugh too. Besides I must tell him, That those which he has set down are not the *Integral Parts of the Christian Faith*; any more than the Head, the Trunk, and the Arms, Hands and Thighs are the *Integral Parts of a Man*: For a Man is not entire without the Legs and Feet too. They are some of the *Integral Parts* indeed; But cannot be called the *Integral Parts*, where any that go to make up the whole Man are left out. Nor those the *Integral*, but some of the *Integral Parts* of the Christian Faith, out of which any of the Doctrines proposed in the New Testa-

ment are omitted: For whatever is there proposed, is proposed to be believed, and so is a part of the Christian Faith.

Before I leave his Catalogue of the *Essential and Integral Parts* of the Gospel, which he has given us, instead of one containing the Articles necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, I must take notice of what he says, whilst he is making it, *p. 9. Why then is there a Treatise publish'd to tell the World that the bare belief of a Messiah is all that is required of a Christian.* As if there were no difference between believing a *Messiah*, and believing *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*: No difference between *required of a Christian*, and required to make a Man a Christian. As if you should say, renouncing his former Idolatry, and being Circumcised and Baptized into *Moses*, was all that was required to make a Man an Israelite; Therefore it was all that was required of an Israelite. For these two Falshoods has he in this one short Sentence, thought fit slyly to Father upon me the *humble imitator of the Jesuits*, as he is pleased to

to call me. And therefore I must desire him to shew,

XIII.

Where the *World* is told in the *Treatise* that I publish'd, That the bare belief of a *Messiah* is all that is required of a *Christian*?

The Six next Pages, *i.e.* from 28. to the End of his Second Chapter, being taken up with nothing but Pulpit Oratory out of its place; and without any reply, apply'd or applicable to any thing I have said in my *Vindication*; I shall pass by, till he shews any thing in them that is so.

In pag. 36. This Giant in Argument, falls on me, and mauls me unmercifully about the Epistles. He begins thus; *The Gentleman is not without his Evasions, and he sees it is high time to make use of them. This puts him in some disorder. For when he comes to speak of my mentioning his ill treatment of the Epistles— you may observe that he begins to grow warmer*

A Second Vindication of the

than before. Now this meek Man is nettled, and one may perceive he is sensible of the Scandal that he hath given to good People by his slighting the Epistolary Writings of the Holy Apostles, yet he is so cunning as to disguise his Passion as well as he can. Let all this impertinent and inconsistent stuff be so. I am angry, and cannot disguise it; I am *cunning* and would disguise it; But yet the quick-sighted *Unmasker* has found me out, that I am *nettled*. What does all this notable Prologue of *Hiccius Doctius*, of a *Cunning Man*, and in effect *no Cunning Man*, in disorder, *warm'd, nettled*, in a *passion* tend to? but only to shew, that these following words of mine, p. 19. of my *Vindication*, viz. “ I require you to
 “ publish to the World those Passages
 “ which shew my contempt of the
 “ Epistles” are so full of heat and disorder, that they need no other Answer, But *what need I, good Sir, do this, when you have done it your self?* A Reply, I own, very soft, and whether I may not say, very silly, let the Reader judge. The *Unmasker* having accused me of contemning the Epistles,

files, my Reply in my *Vindicat.* p. 19.
was thus; “ Sir, when your Angry
“ Fit is over, and the abatement of
“ your Passion has given way to the
“ return of your Sincerity, I shall beg
“ you to read this Passage in the
“ 297. p. of my Book. These holy
“ Writers (*viz.* the Penmen of the
“ Epistles) inspired from above, writ
“ nothing but Truth; and in most
“ places very weighty Truths to us
“ now, for the expounding, clearing
“ and confirming of the Christian Do-
“ ctrine, and establishing those in it,
“ who had imbraced it. And again,
“ p. 299. the other Parts [*i. e.* besides
“ the Gospels and the Acts] of *DI-*
“ *VINE REVELATION* are
“ Objects of Faith, and are so to be
“ received; They are Truths of which
“ none, that is once known to be such,
“ *i. e.* revealed, may or ought to be
“ disbelieved. And if this does not
“ satisfy you, that I have as high a
“ Veneration for the Epistles, as you,
“ or any one can have, I require you
“ to publish to the World those *PAS-*
“ *SAGES*, which shew my con-
“ tempt of them. After such di-

rect words of mine, expressing my veneration for that part of Divine Revelation, which is contain'd in the Epistles, any one but an *Unmasker* would blush to charge me with *contempt* of them, without alledging, when summon'd to it, any word in my Book to justify that charge.

If hardness of Forehead, were strength of Brains, 'twere two to one of his side against any Man I ever yet heard of. I require him to publish to the World those *Passages*, that shew my *contempt* of the Epistles, and he answers me, *he need not do it, for I have done it my self*. Whoever had common sense would understand, that what I demanded was, that he should shew the World where, amongst all I had published, there were any *Passages*, that expressed *contempt* of the Epistles: For it was not expected, he should quote *Passages* of mine, that I had never published. And this accute *Unmasker* (to this) says, I had published them my self. So that the reason why he cannot find them is, because I have published them my self. But, says he, *I appeal to the Reader, whether (after*
your

your tedious Collections out of the four Evangelists) your passing by the Epistles, and neglecting wholly what the Apostles say in them, be not publishing to the World your contempt of them? I demand of him to publish to the World those Passages, which shew my contempt of the Epistles: And he answers, he need not, I have done it my self. How does that appear? I have passed by the Epistles, says he. My passing them by then, are Passages published against the Epistles? For publishing of Passages is what you said you need not do, and what I had done. So that the Passages I have published, containing a contempt of the Epistles, are extant in my saying nothing of them? Surely this same passing by has done some very shrewd displeasure to our poor Unmasker, that he so starts whenever it is but named, and cannot think it contains less than Exclusion, Defiance and Contempt. Here therefore the Proposition remaining to be proved by you is,

XIV.

*That one cannot pass by any thing
without contempt of it.*

And when you have proved it, I shall then ask you, what will become of all those parts of Scripture; all those Chapters and Verses, that you have *passed by* in your Collection of Fundamental Articles? Those that you have vouchsafed to set down, you tell us *are in the Bible on purpose to be believed*. What must become of all the rest, which you have omitted? Are they there not to be believed? And must the *Reader* understand your *passing them by* to be a publishing to the World your *contempt* of them? If so, you have Unmasked your self: If not, but you may *pass by* some parts of Scripture, nay whole Epistles, as you have those of *St. James*, and *St. Jude*, without *contempt*; Why may not I without *contempt* pass by others; But because you have a liberty to do what you will, and I must do but what you in your good pleasure will allow me?

But

But if I ask you whence you have this Privilege above others; You will have nothing to say, except it be according to your usual Skill in Divining, that you know my Heart, and the Thoughts that are in it, which you find not like yours, right, and orthodox, and good; But always evil and perverse, such as I dare not own, but hypocritically either say nothing of, or declare against; But yet with all my cunning I cannot hide them from you; your all knowing penetration always finds them out; You know them, or you guess at them, as is best for your turn, and that's as good: And then presently I am confounded. I doubt whether the World has ever had any two-eyed Man your equal for penetration and a quick sight. The telling by the Spectators looks, what Card he guesses, is nothing to what you can do. You take the height of an Author's Parts, by numbring the Pages of his Book; You can spy an Heresy in him by his saying not a syllable of it; Distinguish him from the Orthodox by his understanding places of Scripture, just as several of the Orthodox do; You can repeat
by

by heart whole Leaves of what is in his Mind to say, before he speaks a word of it; You can discover Designs before they are hatch'd, and all the Intrigues of carrying them on by those who never thought of them. All this, and more you can do, by the Spirit of Orthodoxy, or which is as certain, by your own good Spirit of Invention informing you. Is not this to be an errant Conjuror?

But to your Reply. You say, *after my TEDIOUS Collection out of the four Evangelists, my passing by the Epistles, and neglecting wholly what the Apostles say, &c.* I wondred at first why you mention'd not the *Acts* here, as well as the four Evangelists. For I have not, as you have in other places observed, been sparing of Collections out of the *Acts* too. But there was it seems a Necessity here for your omitting it: For that would have stood too near what followed, in these words; and *neglecting wholly what the Apostles say.* For if it appear'd to the Reader, out of your own Confession, that I allowed and built upon the Divine Authority of what the Apostles say

say in the *Acts*, he could not so easily be mislead into an Opinion, that I contemned what they say in their Epistles. But this is but a slight touch of your Leger-de-main.

And now I ask the Reader what he will think of a Minister of the Gospel, who cannot bear the Texts of Scripture I have produced, nor my Quotations out of the four Evangelists? This which in his *Thoughts of the Causes of Atheism*, p. 114. was want of *Vivacity and Elevation of Mind*, want of a *Vein of Sense and Reason*, yea and of *Elocution too*, is here in his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, a tedious Collection out of the four Evangelists. Those places I have quoted, lie heavy it seems upon his Stomach, and are too many to be got off. But it was my business not to omit one of them; that the Reader might have a full view of the whole tenour of the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles to the Unconverted *Jews and Gentiles*; and might therein see what Faith they were Converted to, and upon their assent to which they were pronounced Believers and admitted into

to the Christian Church. But the *Unmasker* complains there are too many of them: He thinks the Gospel, the good News of Salvation *tedious* from the Mouth of our Saviour and his Apostles: He is of opinion, That before the Epistles were writ, and without believing precisely what he thinks fit to cull out of them, there could be no Christians; And if we had nothing but the four Evangelists, we could not be saved. And yet 'tis plain, that every single one of the Four contains the Gospel of *Jesus Christ*, and at least they all together contain all that is necessary to Salvation. If any one doubt of this, I referr him to Mr. *Chillingworth* for Satisfaction, who hath abundantly proved it.

His following words (were he not the same *Unmasker* all through) would be beyond Parallel. *But let us hear why the Vindicator did not attempt to Collect any Articles out of these Writings, He assigns this as one Reason:*
 “ The Epistles being writ to those
 “ who were already Believers, it could
 “ not be supposed that they were writ
 “ to them to teach them Fundamen-
 “ tals,

“ tals, p. 13, 14. Vindic. Certainly no Man would have conjectured that he would have used such an Evasion as this. I will say that for him, he goes beyond all surmises, he is above all Conjectures, he hath a faculty which no Creature on Earth can ever fathom. Thus far the *Unmasker*, in his Oratorical strain. In what follows he comes to his closer reasoning against what I had said. His words are, *Do we not know that the four Gospels were writ to and for Believers, as well as Unbelievers?* Answ. I grant it. Now let us see your Inference: Therefore what these holy Historians recorded, that our Saviour and his Apostles said and preach'd to Unbelievers, was said and preach'd to Believers. The Discourse which our Saviour had with the Woman of *Samarita*, and her Townsmen, was addressed to Believers; because *St. John* writ his Gospel (wherein it is recorded as a part of our Saviour's History) for Believers as well as Unbelievers. *St. Peter's* Preaching to *Cornelius* and *St. Paul's* Preaching at *Antioch*, at *Thessalonica*, at *Corinth*, &c. was not to Unbelievers,

vers, for their Conversion ; Because St. *Luke* dedicates his History of the Acts of the Apostles to *Theophilus*, who was a Christian, as the *Unmasker* strenuously proves in this Paragraph. Just as if he should say, that the Discourses which *Cæsar* records he had upon several Occasions with the *Gauls* were not addressed to the *Gauls* alone, but to the *Romans* also ; because his Commentaries were writ for the *Romans* as well as others : Or that the Sayings of the Ancient *Greeks* and *Romans* in *Plutarch*, were not spoke by them to their Contemporaries only, because they are recorded by him for the benefit of Posterity.

I perused the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apostles to the Unconverted World, to see what they taught and required to be believed to make Men Christians : And these all I set down, and leave the World to be judge what they contain'd. The Epistles which were all written to those who had imbraced the Faith, and were all Christians already, I thought would not so distinctly shew, what were those Doctrines, which were absolutely necessary

necessary to make Men Christians; they being not writ to convert Unbelievers, but to build up those, who were already Believers, in their most holy Faith. This is plainly expressed in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, V. 11, &c. Of whom, i. e. Christ, we have many things to say and hard to be utter'd, seeing ye are all dull of hearing. For when for the time ye ought to be Teachers, ye have need that one teach you again, which be the first Principles of the Oracles of God; and are become such as have need of Milk and not of strong Meat. For every one that useth milk is unskilful in the word of righteousness; for he is a Babe: But strong meat belongeth to him that is of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised, to discern both good and bad. Therefore leaving the Principles of the Doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection, not laying again the foundation of Repentance from dead Works, and of Faith towards God and of the Doctrine of Baptism, and of laying on of hands, and of the resurrection of the Dead, and of eternal Judgment. Here the Apostle shews what was his De-

sign in writing this Epistle: Not to teach them the Fundamental Doctrines of the Christian Religion, but to lead them on to more Perfection; That is, to greater degrees of Knowledge of the wise Design and wonderful Contrivance and carrying on of the Gospel and the Evidence of it; which he makes out in this Epistle, by shewing its Correspondence with the Old Testament, and particularly with the Oeconomy of the Mosaical Constitution. Here I might ask the *Unmasker*, whether those many things which *St. Paul* tells the *Hebrews* he had to say of Christ, (hard to be utter'd to them, because they were dull of hearing) had not an *immediate respect to the Occasion, Author, Way, Means, or Issue of their Redemption and Salvation*; And therefore, *whether they were such things without the knowledge of which they could not be saved*, as the *Unmasker* lays of such things, *p. 23*. And the like I might ask him concerning those things which the Apostle tells the *Corinthians*, *1 Ep. Chap. III. 2*. that they were *not yet able to bear*. For much to the same purpose, he speaks

to the *Corinthians*, Ep. 1. Ch. III. as in the above-cited places he did to the Hebrews; *That he as a wise Master-Builder had laid the Foundation: And that Foundation*, he himself tells us, is *Jesus the Messiah*, and that there is no other Foundation to be laid. And that in this he laid the Foundation of Christianity at *Corinth*, St. *Luke* records, *Act XVIII. 4.* in these words; *Paul at Corinth reason'd in the Synagogue every Sabbath-day, and testified to the Jews that Jesus was the Messiah.* Upon which Foundation he tells them there might be a Superstructure. But that what is built on the Foundation is not the Foundation, I think I need not prove. He further tells them, that he had desired to build upon this Foundation; But withal says, he had *fed them* till then *with Milk, and not with Meat: because they were Babes, and had not been able to bear it, neither were they yet able.* And therefore this Epistle we see is almost wholly spent in Reproofs of their Miscarriages, and in Exhortations and Instructions relating to Practice, and very little said in it for the explaining any part of the

great *Mystery* of Salvation contain'd in the Gospel.

By these Passages we may see (were it not evident to common sense it self from the Nature of things) that the design of these Epistles was not to lay the Foundations, or teach the Principles of the Christian Religion; they being writ to those who had received them, and were Christians already. The same holds in all the other Epistles: And therefore the Epistles seem'd not to me the properest parts of Scripture, to give us that Foundation distinct from all the Superstructures built on it; Because in the Epistles, the latter was the thing propos'd, rather than the former. For the main intention of the Apostles in writing their Epistles, could not be to do what was done already; to lay down barely the Foundations of Christianity to those who were Christians already; but to build upon it some farther Explication of it, which either their particular Circumstances, or a general evidencing of the Truth, Wisdom, Excellencies, and Privileges, &c. of the Gospel required. This was the
reason

reason that perswaded me to take the Articles of Faith absolutely necessary to be received to make a Man a Christian, only from the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apostles to the Unconverted World, as laid down in the Historical Part of the New Testament : And I thought it a good Reason. It being past doubt, that they in their Preachings proposed to the Unconverted all that was necessary to be believed to make them Christians. And also, that that Faith, upon a Profession whereof any one was admitted into the Church as a Believer, had all that was necessary in it to make him a Christian ; because if it wanted any thing necessary, he had necessarily not been admitted ; unless we can suppose, that any one was admitted into the Christian Church by our Saviour, and his Apostles, who was not yet a Christian ; or pronounced a Believer, who yet wanted something necessary to make him a Believer, *i. e.* was a Believer and not a Believer at the same time. But what those Articles were, which had been Preach'd to those, to whom the Epistles were writ, and

upon the Belief whereof they had been admitted into the Christian Church, and became as they are called *Believers, Saints, Faithful, Elect, &c.* could not be collected out of the Epistles. This, though it were my reason, and must be a reason to every one, who would make this Enquiry; and the *Unmasker* quotes the place where I told him it was my reason; Yet he according to his never erring Illumination, flatly tells me, *p. 38.* that it was not, and adds, *Here then is want of Sincerity, &c.* I must desire him therefore to prove what he says, *p. 38. viz.*

XV.

That by the same Argument that I would perswade that the Fundamentals are not to be sought for in the Epistles, he can prove that they are not to be sought for in the Gospels and in the Acts; because even these were writ to those that believed.

And next I desire him to prove, what he also says in the same Page, *viz.*

XVI.

XVI.

That the Epistles being writ to those that believed, was not an Argument that I did make use of.

He tells us, *p. 38.* That it is the Argument whereby I would persuade, and in the very same Page, a few Lines lower, says, *That it is not the Argument I did make use of.* Who, but an arrant *Unmasker*, would contradict himself so flatly in the same breath? And yet upon that he raises a Complaint of my want of Sincerity.

For want of Sincerity in one of us, we need not go far for an Instance. The next Paragraph, *p. 38.---40.* affords us a gross one of it; Wherein the *Unmasker* argues strongly, not against any thing I had said, but against an Untruth of his own setting up. Towards the latter end of the Paragraph, *p. 40.* he has these words; *It is manifest that the Apostles in their Epistles taught Fundamentals, which is contrary to what this Gentleman says, that such a thing could not be suppos'd;*

And therefore the *Unmasker* has taken a great deal of pains to shew, that there are Fundamental Doctrines to be found in the Epistles; as if I had denied it. And to lead the Reader into an Opinion, that I had said so, he sets down these words, *could not be suppos'd*, as if they were my words. And so they are, but not to that purpose. And therefore he did well not to quote the Page, lest the Reader, by barely turning to the place, should have a clear sight of Falshood, instead of that *Sincerity* which he would make the Reader believe is wanting in me. My words, p. 294. *Of the Reasonableness of Christianity* are, "NOR CAN IT BE SUPPOS'D, that the sending of such Fundamentals was the reason of the Apostles writing to any of them." And a little lower; "The Epistles therefore being all written to those who were already Believers and Christians, the occasion and end of writing them could not be to instruct them in that which was necessary to make them Christians." The thing then that I deny'd, was not, that there were any

any Fundamentals in the Epistles. For p. 295. I have these express words;
“ I do not deny but the great Do-
“ctrines of the Christian Faith are
“dropt here and there, and scatter’d
“up and down in most of them”.
And therefore he might have spared his Endeavours in the next Paragraph to prove, that there may be Fundamentals found in the Epistles, till he finds some body that denies it. And here again, I must repeat my usual Question, that with this sincere Writer is so often necessary, *viz.*

XVII.

Where it is that I say *that it cannot be suppos’d that there are Fundamental Articles in the Epistles?*

If he hopes to shift it off, by the word *taught*; which seems fallaciously put in, as if he meant, that there were some Fundamental Articles *taught* necessary to be believed to make them Christians, in the Epistles, which those who they were writ to knew not before,

fore, in this sense I do deny it, and then this will be the

XVII.

Proposition remaining upon him to prove, viz.

That there are Fundamental Articles necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian taught in the Epistles which those, who they were writ to, knew not before.

The former part of his next Paragraph, p. 40. runs thus: *Hear another feigned Ground of his omitting the Epistles, viz. Because the Fundamental Articles are here promiscuously and without distinction mixt with other Truths. p. 14. But who sees not that this is a mere Elusion? For on the same account he might have forbore to search for Fundamental Articles in the Gospels, for they do not lie there together, but are dispersed up and down: The Doctrinal and Historical Parts are mix'd with one another, but he pretends to sever them. Why then*
did

did he not make a Separation between the Doctrines in the Epistles, and those other Matters that are treated of there? He has nothing to reply to this, and therefore we must again look upon what he has suggested as a cast of his shuffling faculty.

The Argument contain'd in these words is this. A Man cannot well distinguish Fundamental from Non-fundamental Doctrines in the Epistles, where they are promiscuously mixed with Non-fundamental Doctrines: Therefore he cannot well distinguish Fundamental Doctrines from others in the Gospels, and the Acts, where they are mixed with Matters of Fact. As if he should say, one cannot well distinguish a Batchellour of Divinity from other Divines, where several of them stand together promiscuously in the same Habit; Therefore one cannot distinguish a Batchellour of Divinity from a *Billinggate* Orator, where they stand together in their distinct habits. Or that it is as easie to distinguish fine Gold, from that of a little lower Allay, where several pieces of each are mixed together; as it is to distinguish

guish pieces of fine Gold from pieces of Silver, which they are mixed among.

But it seems the *Unmasker* thinks it is as easie to distinguish between Fundamental and not Fundamental Doctrines, in a writing of the same Author, where they are promiscuously mixed together, as it is to distinguish between a Fundamental Doctrine of Faith, and a relation of Matter of Fact, where they are intermixedly reported in the same History. When he has proved this, the *Unmasker* will have more reason to tax me with *Elusion*, *Shuffling* and *Feigning*, in the reason I gave for not collecting Fundamentals out of the Epistles. Till then, all that noise must stand amongst those ridiculous Aires of Triumph and Victory, which he so often gives himself, without the least Advantage to his Cause, or Edification of his Reader, though he should a thousand times say *that I have nothing to reply*.

In the latter part of this Paragraph, he says, *That necessary Truths, Fundamental Principles, may be distinguish'd from*

from those, that are not such, in the Epistolary Writings, by the Nature and Importance of them, by their immediate respect to the Author, and means of our Salvation. *Answ.* If this be so, I desire him to give me a definitive Collection of Fundamentals out of the Epistles, as I have given one out of the Gospels and the Acts. If he cannot do that; 'Tis plain he hath here given a distinguishing mark of Fundamentals, by which he himself cannot distinguish them. But yet I am the Shuffler.

The Argument in the next Paragraph, p. 41. is this.

Necessary Doctrines of Faith, such as God absolutely demands to be believed for Justification, may be distinguished from Rules of Holy Living, with which they are mixed in the Epistles; Therefore Doctrines of Faith necessary, and not necessary, to be believed to make a Man a Christian may be distinguished, as they stand mixed in the Epistles. Which is as good sense as to say, Lambs and Kids may be easily distinguish'd in the same Pen, where they are together;
by

by their different Natures: Therefore the Lambs I absolutely demand of you, as necessary to satisfy me, may be distinguish'd from others in the same Pen, where they are mix'd without any distinction. Doctrines of Faith, and Precepts of Practice, are as distinguishable as doing and believing: And those as easily discernible one from another, as thinking and walking: But Doctrinal Propositions, all of them of Divine Revelation, are of the same Authority, and of the same Species, in respect of the necessity of believing them; And will be eternally undistinguishable into necessary and not necessary to be believed, till there be some other way found, to distinguish them, than that they are in a Book, which is all of Divine Revelation. Though therefore Doctrines of Faith, and Rules of Practice are very distinguishable in the Epistles; yet it does not follow from thence, that Fundamental and not Fundamental Doctrines, Points necessary, and not necessary to be believed to make Men Christians, are easily distinguishable in the Epistles. Which therefore remains

mains to be proved : And it remains incumbent upon him,

XVIII.

To set down the Marks, whereby the Doctrines deliver'd in the Epistles, may easily and exactly be distinguished into Fundamental, and not Fundamental Articles of Faith.

All the rest of that Paragraph, containing nothing against me, must be bound up with a great deal of the like stuff, which the *Unmasker* has put into his Book, to shew the World, he does not imitate me in *Impertinencies, Incoherences, and trifling Excursions*, as he boasts in his first Paragraph. Only I shall desire the Reader to take the whole Passage concerning this Matter, as it stands in my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, p. 295. “ I do not deny,
“ but the great Doctrines of the Chri-
“ stian Faith are dropt here and there,
“ and scatter'd up and down in most
“ of them. But 'tis not in the Epi-
“ stles we are to learn, what are the
“ Funda-

A Second Vindication of the

“ Fundamental Articles of Faith, where
 “ they are promiscuously, and with-
 “ out distinction, mixed with other
 “ Truths, and Discourses, which were
 “ (though for Edification indeed yet)
 “ only occasional. We shall find
 “ and discern those great, and neces-
 “ sary Points best in the Preaching
 “ of our Saviour and his Apostles, to
 “ those who were yet Strangers and
 “ ignorant of the Faith, to bring them
 “ in, and convert them to it. And
 then let him read these words which
 the *Unmasker* has quoted out of them,
It is not in the Epistles that we are to
learn, what are the Fundamental Arti-
cles of Faith, they were written for the
resolving of Doubts, and reforming of
Mistakes; With his Introduction of
 them in these words, *He commands*
the Reader not to stir a jot further than
the Acts. If I should ask him, where
 that Command appears, he must have
 recourse to his old shift, that he did
 not mean as he said, or else stand Con-
 victed of a malicious Untruth. An
 Orator is not bound to speak strict
 Truth, though a Disputant be. But
 this *Unmasker's* Writing against me,
 will

will excuse him from being of the latter: And then why may not Falshoods pass for Rhetorical *flourishes*, in one who hath been used to popular Haranguing; to which Men are not generally so severe, as strictly to examine them, and expect that they should always be found to contain nothing but precise Truth, and strict Reasoning? But yet I must not forget to put upon his Score, this other Proposition of his, which he has, *p.* 42. and ask him to shew,

XIX.

Where it is that I command my Reader not to stir a jot farther than the Acts?

In the next two Paragraphs, *p.* 42. --46. The *Unmasker* is at his natural Play of Declaiming without Proving. 'Tis pity the *Mishna*, out of which he takes his good *breeding*, as it told him that a *well-bred and well-taught Man answers to the first in the first place*, had not given him this Rule too about Order, *viz.* That Proving should go
K before

before Condemning; Else all the fierce Exaggerations, ill Language can heap up, are but empty Scurility. But 'tis no wonder that the *Jewish* Doctors, should not provide Rules for a Christian Divine turn'd *Unmasker*. For where a Cause is to be maintain'd, and a Book to be writ, and Arguments are not at hand, yet something must be found to fill it; Railing in such cases is much easier than Reasoning, especially where a Man's Parts lie that way.

The first of these Paragraphs, *p. 42.* he begins thus; *But let us hear further what this Vindicator saith to excuse his rejection of the Doctrines contained in the Epistles, and his putting us off with one Article of Faith:* And then he quotes these following words of mine:
 “ What if the Author designed his
 “ Treatise, as the Title shews, chiefly
 “ for those who were not yet through-
 “ ly and firmly Christians, purposing
 “ to work upon those, who either
 “ wholly disbelieved, or doubted of
 “ the Truth of the Christian Reli-
 gion ?

Answ.

Answ. This, as he has put it, is a downright Falshood. For the words he quotes, were not used by me *to excuse my rejection of the Doctrines contained in the Epistles*, or to prove there was but *one Article*. But as a reason why I omitted the mention of *Satisfaction*.

To demonstrate this, I shall set down the whole Passage as it is, *p. 6. of my Vindication*; where it runs thus :

“ But what will become of me that
 “ I have not mention’d Satisfaction!
 “ Possibly this Reverend Gentle-
 “ man would have had Charity
 “ enough for a known Writer of the
 “ Brotherhood to have found it by
 “ an *Innuendo* in those words above
 “ quoted, of laying down his Life
 “ for another. But every thing is to
 “ be strained here the other way. For
 “ the Author of the *Reasonableness of*
 “ *Christianity, &c.* is of necessity to
 “ be represented as a *Socinian*; Or else
 “ his Book may be read; and the
 “ Truths in it, which Mr. *Edwards*
 “ likes not, be received; and People
 “ put upon examining. Thus one, as
 “ full of happy Conjectures and Suspi-

“ tions as this Gentleman, might be
 “ apt to argue. But what if the Au-
 “ thor designed his Treatise, as the
 “ Title shews, chiefly for those who
 “ were not yet throughly or firmly
 “ Christians ; Proposing to work on
 “ those who either wholly disbelieved
 “ or doubted of the Truth of the
 “ Christian Religion ?

To this he tells me, *p. 43.* that my
Title says nothing for me, i. e. shews
 not, that I designed my Book for those
 that disbelieved or doubted of the
 Christian Religion.

Answ. I thought that a title that
 professed the *Reasonableness* of any Do-
 ctine shew'd it was intended for those
 that were not fully satisfied of the
Reasonableness of it ; unless Books are
 to be writ to convince those of any
 thing, who are convinced already. But
 possibly this may be the *Unmasker's*
 way : And if one should judge by his
 manner of treating this Subject, with
 Declamation instead of Argument, one
 would think, that he meant it for no
 body, but those who were of his Mind
 already. I thought therefore, *The*
Reasonableness of Christianity as deli-
ver'd

ver'd in the Scripture, a proper Title to signifie whom it was chiefly meant for : And, I thank God, I can with satisfaction say it has not wanted its effect upon some of them. But the *Unmasker* proves for all that, that I could not design it chiefly for Disbelievers or Doubters of the Christian Religion. For, says he, p. 43. *How those that wholly disregard and disbelieve the Scriptures of the New Testament, as Gentiles, Jews, Mahometans and Atheists do* (I crave leave to put in Theists instead of Atheists, for a reason presently to be mention'd) *are like to attend to the Reasonableness of Christianity as deliver'd in the Scripture is not to be conceived; And therefore we look upon this as all meer Sham and Sophistry.* Answ. Though the *Unmasker* teaches good breeding out of the *Mishna*, yet I thought he had been a Minister of the Gospel, and had taught Christianity out of the Scripture. Why! Good Sir, would you teach *Jews* and *Mahometans* Christianity out of the *Talmud* and *Alcoran*; because they are the Books, that at present they attend to and believe? Or would you, laying

by the Authority of all Books, Preach Religion to Infidels in your own Name, and by your own Authority; laying aside the Scripture? *Is it not to be conceived*, no not by a Christian Divine, that the way to make Unbelievers Christians, is to shew them the Reasonableness of the Religion contained in the Scripture? But it seems the *Unmasker* has a peculiar way of Preaching and propagating Christianity without the Scripture, as some Men have a peculiar way of disputing without Reason.

In the beginning of this Paragraph, p. 43. the *Unmasker*, that is always a fair Interpreter of my meaning, and never fails to know it better than I do, tells me, That by those, that wholly disbelieve, *I must mean Atheists, Turks, Jews and Pagans*; and by those that are not firmly Christians, *a few weak Christians*. But did our *Unmasker* never hear of Unbelievers under a denomination distinct from that of *Atheists, Turks, Jews, and Pagans*? Whilst the Pulpit and the Press have so often had up the Name of *Theists* or *Deists*, has that Name wholly scaped him? 'Twas these

these I chiefly designed, and I believe no body of all that read my Vindication, but the *Unmasker* mistook me, if he did. But there at least, *p.* 9. he might have found the Name, as of a sort of Unbelievers not unknown amongst us. But whatever he thought, it was convenient and a sort of *Prudence* in him (when he would persuade others, that I had not a Design which I say I had) to lessen as much as he could, and cover the need of any such Design, and so make it, that I could not intend my Book to work upon those, that disbelieved, or did not firmly believe; by insinuating there were *few* or none such amongst us. Hence he says that by those that are not thoroughly and firmly Christians, *I mean a FEW weak Christians*; as well as under those, who wholly disbelieve he left the *Theists* out of my meaning. I am very glad to hear from the *Unmasker*, that there are but *few weak Christians*, few that have Doubts about the Truth of Christianity amongst us. But if there be not a great number of *Deists*, and that the preventing their increase be not

worth every true Christian's Care and Endeavours, those who have been so loud against them have been much to blame; and I wish to God there were no reason for their Complaints. For these therefore I take the liberty to say, as I did before, that I chiefly designed my Book; And shall not be ashamed of this *Sophistry* as you call it, if it can be *Sophistry* to alledge a Matter of Fact that I know; Till you have Arguments to convince me, that you know my intention in publishing it, better than I do my self. And I shall think it still no blameable *Prudence*, however you exclaim against *Prudence*, (as perhaps you have some reason) that “ I mention'd only those
 “ Advantages, that all Christians are
 “ agreed in; And that I observed that
 “ command of the Apostle, *Rom. XIV. 1.*
 “ Him that is weak in the Faith receive ye, but not to doubtful Disputations; without being a *Socinian*.
 “ I think I did not amiss, that I offer'd to the belief of those that
 “ stood off, that, and only that, which
 “ our Saviour and his Apostles preach'd
 “ for the reducing the Unconverted
 “ World.

“ World. And would any one think
 “ he in earnest went about to per-
 “ swade Men to be Christians, who
 “ should use that as an Argument to
 “ recommend the Gospel, which he
 “ has observed Men to lay hold on as
 “ an Objection against it? To urge
 “ such Points of Controversie as Ne-
 “ cessary Articles of Faith, when we
 “ see our Saviour and the Apostles
 “ urged them not as necessary to be
 “ believed to make Men Christians,
 “ is (by our own Authority) to add
 “ Prejudices to Prejudices, and to
 “ block up our own way to those
 “ Men, whom we would have access
 “ to, and prevail upon.

I have repeated this again out of
 the 7th. Page of my *Vindication*,
 where there is more to the same pur-
 pose; That the Reader may see how
 fully the *Unmasker* has answer'd it.

Because I said, “ Would any one
 “ blame my Prudence if I mention'd
 “ only those Advantages, which all
 “ Christians are agreed in”. The *Un-*
masker adds, p. 44. *Socinian Christians*,
 and then as if the naming of that
 had gained him his Point, he goes
 on

on victoriously thus, *He has bethought himself better since he first Publish'd his Notions, and (as the result of that) he now begins to resolve, what he writ, into Prudence. I know whence he had this Method (and 'tis likely he has taken more than this from the same hands) viz. from the Missionary Jesuits, that went to Preach the Gospel to the People of China. We are told, that they instructed them in some Matters relating to our Saviour; they let them know that Jesus was the Messias, the Person promised to be sent into the World; But they conceal'd his Sufferings and Death, and they would not let them know any thing of his Passion and Crucifixion. So our Author (their humble Imitator) undertakes to instruct the World in Christianity, with an omission of its Principal Articles, and more especially that of the Advantage we have by Christ's Death, which was the prime thing design'd in his coming into the World. This he calls Prudence: So that to hide from the People the main Articles of the Christian Religion, to disguise the Faith of the Gospel, to betray Christianity it self, is according*

to this excellent Writer, the Cardinal Virtue of Prudence. May we be deliver'd then, say I, from a Prudential Racovian. And there ends the ratling for this time; not to be outdone by any Piece of Clock-work in the Town. When he is once set a going, he runs on like an Alarm, always in the same strain of noisy empty Declamation (wherein every thing is suppos'd and nothing prov'd) till his own weight has brought him to the Ground? And then, being wound up with some new Topick, takes another run, whether it makes for or against him it matters not; he has laid about him with ill Language, let it light where it will, and the *Vindicator* is paid off.

That I may keep the due distance in our different ways of Writing, I shall shew the Reader, that I say not this at random; but that the place affords me occasion to say so. He begins this Paragraph with these words, p. 42. *Let us hear farther what this Vindicator says to excuse his rejection of the Doctrines contain'd in the Epistles.* This rejection of the Doctrines contain'd in the Epistles, was the
the

the not mentioning the *Satisfaction* of Christ, amongst those Advantages I shew'd, that the World received by his coming. This appears by the words he here quotes, as my excuse for that omission. In which place, I also produced some Passages in my Book which *sounded like it*, some words of Scripture that are used to prove it; But this will not content him: I am for all that, a *Betrayer of Christianity and Contemner of the Epistles*. Why? Because I did not out of them name *Satisfaction*. If you will have the truth of it, Sir, there is not any such word in any one of the Epistles, or other Books of the New Testament, in my Bible, as *Satisfying* or *Satisfaction* made by our Saviour; and so I could not put it into my *Christianity as deliver'd in the Scripture*. If mine be not a true Bible, I desire you to furnish me with one that is more Orthodox; or if the Translators have *hid that main Article of the Christian Religion*, they are the *betrayers of Christianity, and Contemnners of the Epistles*, who did not put it there; and not I, who did not take a word from thence, which

which they did not put there. For truly, I am not a Maker of Creeds; nor dare add either to the Scripture, or to the Fundamental Articles of the Christian Religion.

But you will say *Satisfaction*, though not named in the Epistles, yet may plainly be collected out of them. *Answ.* And so it may out of several places in my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, some whereof, which I took out of the Gospels, I mention'd in my *Vindication*, p. 5. and others of them which I took out of the Epistles, which I shall point out to you now: As p. 74. I say the Design of our Saviour's coming was to be *OFFERED* up; And p. 158. I speak of the Work of our *REDEMPTION*; words which in the Epistles are taken to imply *Satisfaction*. And therefore if that be enough, I see not, but I may be free from *betraying Christianity*; But if it be necessary to Name the word *Satisfaction*, and he that does not so is a *Betrayer of Christianity*, you will do well to consider how you will acquit the Holy Apostles, from that bold Imputation; which if it be extended

as far as it will go, will scarce come short of Blasphemy ; For I do not remember that our Saviour has any where named *Satisfaction*, or implied it plainer in any words than those I have quoted from him. And he, I hope, will scape the Intemperance of your Tongue.

You tell me, I had my *Prudence* from the *Missionary Jesuits in China*, who conceal'd our Saviour's *Suffering and Death* ; because I undertake to instruct the World in Christianity, with an omission of its *Principal Articles*. And I pray, Sir, from whom did you learn your *Prudence*, when taking upon you to teach the *Fundamental Doctrines of Christianity*, in your *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*, you left out several, that you have been pleased since to add in your *Socinianism Unmask'd* ? Or if I, as you say here, betray Christianity by this *Omission of this Principal Article* ; What do you, who are a *Professed Teacher* of it, if you omit any principal Article ; Which your *Prudence* is so wary in, that you will not say you have given us all that are necessary to *Salvation*, in that List you have last published ? I pray who
acts

acts best the Jesuit (whose *humble Imitator* you say I am) you or I; when pretending to give a Catalogue of Fundamentals, you have not reduced them to direct Propositions; but have left some of them indefinite, to be collected as every one pleases; and instead of telling us it is a perfect Catalogue of Fundamentals, plainly shuffe it off, and tell me, *p. 22. If that will not content me, you are sure you can do nothing that will; If I require more, it is Folly in you to comply with me?* One part of what you here say, I own to you, favours not much of the Skill of a Jesuit. You confess your inability, and I believe it to be perfectly true; That if what you have done already (which is nothing at all) *will not content me, you are sure, you can do nothing that will content me,* or any reasonable Man, that shall demand of you a compleat Catalogue of Fundamentals. But you make it up pretty well, with a Confidence becoming one of that Order. For he must have rub'd his Forehead hard, who in the same Treatise, where he so severely condemns the Imperfection
of

of my List of Fundamentals, confesses that he cannot give a compleat Catalogue of his own.

You publish to the World in this 44, and the next Page, that *I hide from the People the main Articles of the Christian Religion; I disguise the faith of the Gospel, betray Christianity it self, and imitate the Jesuits that went to Preach the Gospel to the People of China, by my Omission of its principal or main Articles.*

Answ. I know not how **I** *disguise* the Faith of the Gospel, &c. in imitation of the Jesuits in China; unless taking Men off from the Inventions of Men, and recommending to them the Reading and Study of the Holy Scripture to find what the Gospel is and requires, be *a disguising of the Faith of the Gospel, a betraying of Christianity, and an imitating of the Jesuits.* Besides, Sir, if one may ask you, in what School did you learn that prudent wariness and reserve, which so eminently appears, *p. 24.* of your *Socinianism Unmask'd*, in these words: *These Articles* (meaning those which you had before enumerated as Fundamental)

mental) of Faith, are such as must *IN SOME MEASURE* be known and assented to by a Christian, such as must *GENERALLY* be received, and imbraced by him? You will do well the next time to set down, how far your Fundamentals must be known, assented to, and received; to avoid the suspicion, that there is a little more of Jesuitism in these Expressions, *in some measure known and assented to, and generally receiv'd and imbraced*, than what becomes a sincere Protestant Preacher of the Gospel. For your speaking so doubtfully of knowing and assenting to those, which you give us for Fundamental Doctrines, which belong (as you say) to the very *essence of Christianity*, will hardly scape being imputed to your want of Knowledge, or want of Sincerity. And indeed the word *General* is in familiar use with you, and stands you in good stead, when you would say something, you know not what, as I shall have occasion to remark to you when I come to your 91 Page.

Further, I do not remember where it was, that I mention'd or undertook

L

to

to set down all the *principal* or *main Articles of Christianity*. To change the terms of the Question from *Articles* necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, into *principal* or *main Articles*, looks a little Jesuitical. But to pass by that; The Apostles when they *went to preach the Gospel to People* as much Strangers to it, as the *Chineses* were, when the *Europeans* came first amongst them, *Did they hide from the People the main Articles of the Christian Religion, disguise the Faith of the Gospel, and betray Christianity it self?* If they did not, I am sure I have not: For I have not omitted any of the *main Articles* which they Preached to the Unbelieving World. Those I have set down, with so much care not to omit any of them, that you blame me for it more than once, and call it *tedious*. However you are pleased to acquit or condemn the Apostles in the case by your Supreme Determination, I am very indifferent. If you think fit to condemn them for *disguising* or *betraying the Christian Religion*, because they said no more of *Satisfaction*, than I have done,

done, in their Preaching at first to their Unbelieving Auditors, *Jews* or *Heathens*, to make them as I think Christians (for that I am now speaking of) I shall not be sorry to be found in their Company under what censure soever. If you are pleased graciously to take off this your censure from them, for this *omission*, I shall claim a share in the same Indulgence.

But to come to what perhaps you will think your self a little more concerned not to censure, than what the *Apostles* did so long since; for you have given instances of being very apt to make bold with the Dead; Pray tell me, does the Church of *England* admit People into the Church of Christ at hap-hazard? Or without proposing, and requiring a Profession of all, that is necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian? If she does not, I desire you to turn to the Baptism of those of riper Years in our Liturgy: Where the Priest asking the Convert particularly, whether he believes the *Apostles Creed*, which he repeats to him; Upon his Profession that he does, and that he desires to be baptized into that

L 2.

Faith,

Faith, without one word of any other Articles, Baptizes him; and then declares him a Christian, in these words: *We receive this Person into the Congregation of Christ's Flock, and sign him with the sign of the Cross, in token that he shall not be asham'd—— to CONTINUE Christ's faithful Soldier and Servant.* In all this there is not one word of *Satisfaction*, no more than in my Book, nor so much neither. And here I ask you, whether for this *omission*, you will pronounce that the Church of *England disguises the Faith of the Gospel*? However you think fit to treat me, yet methinks you should not let your self loose so freely against our first Reformers, and the Fathers of our Church ever since, as to call them *Betrayers of Christianity it self*, because they think not so much necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, as you are pleased to put down in your Articles; but omit, as well as I, your *main Article of Satisfaction*.

Having thus notably harangued up on the occasion of my saying, "Would any one blame my Prudence", and thereby made me a *Socinian*, a *Jesuit*,
and

and a *Betrayer of Christianity it self*, he has in that answer'd all that such a *Miscreant* as I do or can say; and so passes by all the Reasons I gave, for what I did; without any other notice or answer, but only denying a Matter of Fact, which I only can know, and he cannot, *viz.* My design in Printing my *Reasonableness of Christianity*.

In the next Paragraph, p. 45. in answer to these words of *St. Paul, Rom. XIV. 1. Him that is weak in the Faith receive ye, but not to doubtful Disputations*, which I brought as a reason, why I mention'd not *Satisfaction* amongst the Benefits receiv'd by the coming of our Saviour; Because, as I tell him in my *Vindication*, p. 5. *My Reasonableness of Christianity*, as the title shews, was "designed chiefly
" for those who were not yet through-
" ly or firmly Christians". He replies, and I desire him to prove it.

XX.

That I pretend a design of my Book which was never so much as thought of, till I was sollicitated by my Brethren to Vindicate it.

All the rest in this Paragraph being either nothing to this place of the *Romans*, or what I have answer'd elsewhere, needs no farther Answer.

The next two Paragraphs, *p. 46.-49.* are meant for an Answer to something I had said concerning the Apostles Creed, upon the occasion of his charging my Book with *Socinianism*. They begin thus.

This Author of the New Christianity.
Answ. This New Christianity is as old as the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles, and a little older than the *Unmasker's* System. *Wisely objects that the Apostles Creed hath none of those Articles which I mention'd, p. 12, 13.*
Answ. If that Author *wisely objects*, the *Unmasker* would have done well to have replied *wisely*. But for a Man *wisely* to reply it is in the first place requisite, that the Objection be truly and fairly set down in its full force, and not represented short, and as will best serve the Answerers turn to reply to. This is neither *wise* nor honest: And this first part of a *wise* Reply the *Unmasker* has failed in. This will appear from my words and the occasion
of

of them. The *Unmasker* had accused my Book of *Socinianism*, for omitting some Points, which he urged as necessary Articles of Faith. To which I answer'd, That he had done so only "to give it an ill Name, not because
" it was *Socinian*, for he had no more
" reason to charge it with *Socinia-*
" *nism* for the Omissions he mentions,
" than the Apostles Creed". These are my words, which he should have either set down out of *p. 12.* which he quotes, or at least given the Objection as I put it, if he had meant to have clear'd it by a fair Answer. But he, instead thereof, contents himself that *I object, that the Apostles Creed bath none of those Articles and Doctrines which the Unmasker mention'd.* Answ. This at best is but a part of my Objection, and not to the purpose. I there meant, without the rest join'd to it; which it has pleased the *Unmasker* according to his laudable way to conceal. My Objection therefore stands thus,

That the same Articles, for the
Omission whereof the *Unmasker*
L 4 charges

A Second Vindication of the

charges my Book with *Socinianism*, being also omitted in the Apostles Creed, he has no more reason to Charge my Book with *Socinianism*, for the Omissions mention'd, than he hath to charge the Apostles Creed with *Socinianism*.

To this Objection of mine, let us now see how he answers, *p.* 47.

Nor does any considerate Man wonder at it [i. e. That the Apostles Creed hath none of those Articles and Doctrines which he had mention'd] For the Creed is a form of outward Profession, which is chiefly to be made in the Publick Assemblies, when Prayers are put up in the Church and the Holy Scriptures are read. Then this Abridgment of Faith is properly used, or when there is not generally time or opportunity to make any Enlargement. But we are not to think it expressly contains in it all the necessary and weighty Points, all the important Doctrines of Belief, it being only designed to be an Abstract.

Answ.

Answ. Another indispensable requisite in a *wise* Reply is, that it should be pertinent. Now what can there be more impertinent, than to confess the Matter of Fact upon which the Objection is grounded, but instead of destroying the Inference drawn from that Matter of Fact, only amuse the Reader with wrong Reasons, why that Matter of Fact was so?

No *considerate Man*, he says, *doth wonder* that the Articles and Doctrines he mentioned, are omitted in the Apostles Creed: Because *that Creed is a form of outward Profession*. *Answ.* A *Profession!* of what I beseech you? Is it a *Form* to be used for Form's sake? I thought it had been a *Profession* of something, even of the Christian Faith: And if it be so, any *considerate Man may wonder* necessary Articles of the Christian Faith should be left out of it. For how it can be an *outward Profession* of the Christian Faith, without containing the Christian Faith, I do not see; unless a Man can *outwardly profess* the Christian Faith in words, that do not contain or express it, *i. e.* profess the Christian Faith, when he
does

does not profess it. But he says, 'tis a *Profession chiefly to be made use of in Assemblies.* *Answ.* Do those solemn *Assemblies* privilege it from containing the necessary Articles of the Christian Religion? This proves not that it does not, or was not *designed* to contain all Articles necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian; unless the *Unmasker* can prove that a *Form of outward Profession* of the Christian Faith, that contains all such necessary Articles, cannot be made use of in the Publick Assemblies. *In the Publick Assemblies,* says he, *when Prayers are put up by the Church and the Holy Scriptures are read, then this Abridgment of Faith is properly used; or when there is not generally time or opportunity to make an Enlargement.* *Answ.* But that which contains not what is absolutely necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, can no where be properly used as a *form of outward Profession* of the Christian Faith, and least of all in the solemn *Publick Assemblies.* All the sense I can make of this is, That *this Abridgment* of the Christian Faith, *i.e.* imperfect Collection

tion (as the *Unmasker* will have it) of some of the Fundamental Articles of Christianity in the Apostles Creed, which omits the greatest part of them, is made use of *as a form of outward Profession* of but part of the Christian Faith in the *Publick Assemblies*, when by reason of reading of the *Scripture* and *Prayers*, there is not *time* or *opportunity* for a full and perfect Profession of it.

'Tis strange the Christian Church should not find *time* nor *opportunity* in Sixteen hundred Years to make, in any of her Publick Assemblies, a Profession of so much of her Faith as is necessary to make a Man a Christian. But pray tell me, has the Church any such full and compleat form of Faith, that hath in it all those Propositions, you have given us for necessary Articles (not to say any thing of those which you have reserved to your self in your own Breast, and will not communicate) of which the Apostles Creed is only a scanty *form*, a brief imperfect *abstract*, *used* only to save time in the Croud of other pressing Occasions, that are always in hast to be dispatch'd?

If

If she has, the *Unmasker* will do well to produce it. If the Church has no such compleat form, besides the Apostle's Creed, any where, of Fundamental Articles, he will do well to leave talking idly of this *Abstract*, as he goes on to do in the following words:

But, says he, we are not to think that it expressly contains in it all the necessary and weighty Points, all the important Doctrines of our Belief, it being only designed to be an Abstract. Answ. Of what, I beseech you, is it an *Abstract*? For here the *Unmasker* stops short, and as one that knows not well what to say, speaks not out what it is an *Abstract* of; But provides himself a Subterfuge in the generality of the preceding terms of *necessary and weighty Points*, and *Important Doctrines*, jumbled together; which can be there of no other use, but to cover his Ignorance, or Sophistry. For the Question being only about *necessary Points*, to what purpose are *weighty and important Doctrines* join'd to them; unless he will say, that there is no difference between *necessary and weighty Points*,

Points, Fundamental and *important Doctrines*? And if so, then the distinction of Points into necessary and not necessary, will be foolish and impertinent; And all the Doctrines contain'd in the Bible will be absolutely necessary to be explicitly believed by every Man to make him a Christian. But taking it for granted, that the distinction of Truths contain'd in the Gospel into Points absolutely necessary, and not absolutely necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, is good; I desire the *Unmasker* to tell us, what the Apostles Creed is an Abstract of. He will perhaps answer, that he has told us already in this very Page, where he says it is an *Abridgment of Faith*, and he has said true in words, but saying those words by rote after others, without understanding them, he has said so in a sense, that is not true. For he supposes it an *Abridgment of Faith*, by containing only a few of the necessary Articles of Faith, and leaving out the far greater part of them; And so takes a part of a thing for an *Abridgment* of it; Whereas an *Abridgment*, or *Abstract* of any thing, is the whole
in

in little, and if it be of a Science or Doctrine, the *Abridgment* consists in the essential or necessary Parts of it; contracted into a narrower compass, than where it lies diffus'd in the ordinary way of delivery, amongst a great number of Transitions, Explanations, Illustrations, Proofs, Reasonings, Corollaries, &c. All which, though they make a part of the Discourse wherein that Doctrine is deliver'd, are left out in the *Abridgment* of it, wherein all the necessary parts of it are drawn together into a less room. But though an *Abridgment* need to contain none but the essential and necessary parts, yet all those it ought to contain; Or else it will not be an *Abridgment* or *Abstract* of that thing, but an *Abridgment* only of a part of it. I think it could not be said to be an *Abridgment* of the Law contain'd in an Act of Parliament, wherein any of the things required by that Act were omitted; which yet commonly may be reduced into a very narrow compass, when strip'd of all the Motives, Ends, Enacting Forms, &c. expressed in the Act it self. If this does not satisfy the
Ur-

Unmasker what is properly an *Abridgment*; I shall referr him to Mr. *Chillingworth*, who I think will be allow'd to understand sense, and to speak it properly, at least as well as the *Unmasker*. And what he says, happens to be in the very same Question between *Knot* the Jesuit, and him; that is here between the *Unmasker*, and me: 'Tis but putting the *Unmasker* in the Jesuit's place, and my self (if it may be allow'd me without Vanity) in Mr. *Chillingworth's* the Protestants, and Mr. *Chillingworth's* very words, Chap. IV. §. 65. will exactly serve for my Answer. " You trifle affectedly, " confounding the Apostles Belief of " the whole Religion of Christ, as it " comprehends both what we are to " do, and what we are to believe, with " that part of it which contains not " Duties of Obedience, but only the " necessary Articles of simple Faith. " Now, though the Apostles Belief be " in the former sense, a larger thing " than that which we call the Apostles " Creed; Yet in the latter sense of " the word, the Creed (I say) is a full " Comprehension of their Belief, which " you

“ you your self have formerly con-
 “ fessed, though somewhat fearfully
 “ and inconstantly. And here again
 “ unwillingness to speak the Truth
 “ makes you speak that which is
 “ hardly sense, and call it an *Abridg-*
 “ *ment of some Articles of Faith.* For
 “ I demand those *some Articles* which
 “ you speak of, which are they? Those
 “ that are out of the Creed, or those
 “ that are in it? Those that are in it,
 “ it comprehends at large, and there-
 “ fore it is not an *Abridgment* of them.
 “ Those that are out of it, it com-
 “ prehends not at all, and therefore
 “ it is not an *Abridgment* of them.
 “ If you would call it now an *Abridg-*
 “ *ment of Faith,* this would be sense;
 “ and signify thus much; That all the
 “ necessary Articles of the Christian
 “ Faith are comprised in it. For this
 “ is the proper Duty of *Abridgments,*
 “ to leave out nothing necessary”. So
 that in Mr. *Chillingworth's* judgment
 of an *Abridgment,* it is not sense to say
 as you do, p. 47. That we are not to
 think that the *Apostles Creed* expressly
 contains in it all the necessary Points of
 our Belief, it being only designed to be
 an

an Abstract, or an Abridgment of Faith. But on the contrary, we must conclude it contains in it all the necessary Articles of Faith, for that very reason, because it is an *Abridgment of Faith*, as the *Unmasker* calls it. But whether this, that Mr. *Chillingworth* has given us here, be the nature of an *Abridgment*, or no; this is certain, that the Apostles Creed cannot be a *form of Profession* of the Christian Faith, if any part of the Faith necessary to make a Man a Christian be left out of it: And yet such a *Profession* of Faith would the *Unmasker* have this *Abridgment* of Faith to be. For a little lower in the 47. p. he says in express terms, *That if a Man believe no more than is in express terms in the Apostles Creed, his Faith will not be the Faith of a Christian.* Wherein he does great Honour to the Primitive Church, and particularly to the Church of *England*. The Primitive Church admitted converted Heathens to Baptism, upon the Faith contain'd in the Apostles Creed: A bare Profession of that Faith, and no more, was required of them to be received into the Church and made

M Mem-

A Second Vindication of the

Members of Christ's Body. How little different the Faith of the Ancient Church was from the Faith I have mentioned, may be seen in these words of *Tertullian*; *Regula fidei una omnino est, sola, immobilis, irreformabilis, Credendi scilicet in unicum deum omnipotentem Mundi conditorem, & filium ejus Jesum Christum, natum ex Virgine Maria, Crucifixum sub Pontio Pilato, tertia die resuscitatum à Mortuis, receptum in Cælis, Sedentem nunc ad dextram Patris, Venturum judicare vivos & Mortuos per carnis etiam resurrectionem. Hâc lege fidei manente, cætera iam disciplinæ & conversationis admittunt novitatem correctionis*, *Tert. de Virg. Velan. in Principio*. This was the Faith that in *Tertullian's* time sufficed to make a Christian. And the Church of *England*, as I have remarked already, only proposes the Articles of the Apostles Creed to the Convert to be baptized, and upon his Professing a Belief of them, asks whether he will be Baptized in *THIS FAITH*, which (if we will believe the *Unmasker*) is not the Faith of a Christian. However the Church, without

out any more ado, upon the Profession of *THIS FAITH*, and no other, Baptizes them into it. So that the Ancient Church, if the *Unmasker* may be believed, baptized Converts into that Faith which *is not the Faith of a Christian*. And the Church of *England*, when she Baptizes any one, makes him not a Christian. For he that is Baptized only into a Faith that *is not the Faith of a Christian*, I would fain know how he can thereby be made a Christian? So that if the Omissions, which he so much blames in my Book, make me a *Socinian*, I see not how the Church of *England* will escape that Censure; Since those Omissions are in that very Confession of Faith, which she proposes, and upon a Profession whereof she Baptizes those whom she designs to make Christians. But it seems that the *Unmasker* (who has made bold to Unmask her too) reasons right, that the Church of *England* is mistaken, and makes none but *Socinian Christians*, or (as he is pleased now to declare) no Christians at all. Which if true, the *Unmasker* were best look to it, whether he himself be

A Second Vindication of the

a Christian, or no : For 'tis to be fear'd, he was baptized only into that Faith, which he himself confesses *is not the Faith of a Christian.*

But he brings himself off in these following words; *All matters of Faith in some manner may be reduced to this brief Platform of Belief.* *Answ.* If that be enough to make him a true and an Orthodox Christian, he does not consider whom in this way he brings off with him : For I think he cannot deny, that all Matters of Faith in some manner may be reduced to that *Abstract* of Faith which I have given, as well as to that brief *Platform* in the Apostles Creed. So that for ought I see, by this rule, we are Christians, or not Christians ; Orthodox or not Orthodox, equally together.

But yet he says in the next words, *When he calls it an Abstract or Abbreviature, it is implied, that there are more Truths to be known and assented to by a Christian in order to making him really so, than what we meet with here.* The quite contrary whereof (as has been shewn) is implied by its being called an *Abstract*. But what is that to
the

the purpose? 'Tis not fit *Abstracts* and *Abbreviatures* should stand in *Unmasker's* way. They are Sounds Men have used for what they pleased, and why may not the *Unmasker* do so too; And use them in a Sense, that may make the Apostles Creed be only a broken scrap of the Christian Faith? However in great Condescension, being willing to do the Apostles Creed what honour he could, he says, That *all Matters of Faith in some manner may be reduced to this brief Platform of Belief*: But yet when it is set in competition with the Creed, which he himself is making (for it is not yet finish'd) it is by no means to be allow'd as sufficient to make a Man a Christian. *There are more Truths to be known and assented to in order to make a Man really a Christian.* Which what they are, the Church of *England* shall know, when this new Reformer thinks fit: And then she may be able to propose to those, who are not yet so, a Collection of Articles of Belief, and Baptize them anew into a Faith, which will really make them Christians; But hitherto, if the *Unmasker*

ker may be credited, she has failed in it.

Yet he craves leave to tell me in the following words, p. 48. That the Apostles Creed hath more in it than I or my Brethren will subscribe to. Were it not the Undoubted Privilege of the *Unmasker* to know me better than I do my self, (for he is always telling me something of my self which I did not know) I would in my turn crave leave to tell him, that this is the Faith I was baptized into, no one tittle whereof I have renounced, that I know; And that I heretofore thought, that gave me title to be a Christian. But the *Unmasker* hath otherwise determin'd: And I know not now where to find a Christian. For the Belief of the Apostles Creed will not it seems make a Man one: And what other Belief will, it does not yet please the *Unmasker* to tell us. But yet as to the *Subscribing* to the Apostles Creed, I must take leave to say, however the *Unmasker* may be right in the Faith, he is out in the Morals of a Christian; It being against the Charity of one, that is really so, to pronounce, as he does,

does, peremptorily in a thing, that he cannot know; and to affirm positively what I know to be a downright Falsehood. But what others will do it is not my talent to determine: That belongs to the *Unmasker*. Though as to all that are my *Brethren* in the Christian Faith, I may answer for them too, that they will also with me do that without which in that sense they cannot be my Brethren.

P. 49. The *Unmasker* smartly convinces me of no small Blunder in these words. *But was it not judiciously said by this Writer, that "it is well for the Compilers of the Creed, that they lived not in my days"*. P. 12. *I tell you Friend, it was impossible they should, for the Learned Usher, and Vossius, and others, have proved that that Symbol was drawn up not at once, but that some Articles of it were adjoynd many years after, far beyond the extent of any Man's Life, and therefore the Compilers of the Creed could not live in my days, nor could I live in theirs.* *Answ.* But it seems that had they liv'd altogether, you could have liv'd in their days. *But, says he, I let this*

pass, as one of the Blunders of our thoughtful and musing Author. Answ. And I tell you Friend, that unless it were to shew your reading in Usher and Vossius, you had been better let this Blunder of mine alone. Does not the Unmasker give here a clear Proof, that he is no Changeling? Whatever Argument he takes in hand, weighty or trivial, material or not material to the thing in question, he brings it to the same sort of sense and force. He would shew me guilty of an absurdity in saying, " It was well for the Compilers of the Creed, that they lived " not in his days". This he proves to be a Blunder; because they all lived not in one anothers days; Therefore it was an absurdity to suppose they might all live in his days. As if there were any greater absurdity to bring the Compilers, who lived possibly within a few Centuries of one another by a Supposition into one time, than it is to bring the Unmasker, and any one of them who lived a Thousand Years distant one from another, by a Supposition to be Contemporaries; For 'tis by reason of the Compilers

pilars living at a distance one from another, that he proves it impossible for him to be their Contemporary. As if it were not as impossible in Fact for him who was not born till above a Thousand Years after to live in any of their Days, as it is for any one of them to live in either of those Compilers days that died before him. The Supposition of their living together is as easie of one as the other, at what distance soever they lived, and how many soever there were of them. This being so, I think it had been better for the *Unmasker* to have let alone the *Blunder*, and shew'd (which was his Business) that he does not accuse the Compilers of the Creed of being *all over Socinianized*, as well as he does me, since they were as guilty as I of the omission of those Articles (viz. *That Christ is the Word of God. That God was incarnate. The eternal and ineffable Generation of the Son of God. That the Son is in the Father, and Father in the Son, which expresses their Unity*) for the omission whereof, the *Unmasker* laid *Socinianism* to my Charge. So that
it

it remains still upon his Score to shew,

XXI.

Why these Omissions in the Apostles Creed not as well make that Abstract, as my Abridgment of Faith to be Socinian.

Page 53. The Unmasker desires the Reader to observe, that this lank Faith of mine is in a manner no other than the Faith of a Turk. And I desire the Reader to observe, that this Faith of mine, was all that our Saviour and his Apostles preach'd to the Unbelieving World. And this our Unmasker cannot deny; As I think will appear to any one, who observes what he says, p. 76, and 77. of his Socinianism Unmask'd. And that they preach'd nothing but a Faith, that was in a manner no other than the Faith of a Turk; I think none amongst Christians, but this bold Unmasker, will have the irreverence profanely to say.

He tells us, p. 54. That the Musselmen (or as he has for the Information of

of his Reader very pertinently proved, should be writ *Moslemim*, without which, perhaps we should not have known his Skill in *Arabick*), or in plain English the Mahometans *believe that Christ is a good Man, and not above the Nature of a Man, and sent of God to give instruction to the World: And my Faith*, he says, *is of the very same Scantling.* This I shall desire him to prove, or which in other words he insinuates in this, and the neighbouring Pages, *viz.*

XXII.

That that Faith which I have affirm'd to be the Faith, which is required to make a Man a Christian, is no other, than what Turks believe, and is contain'd in the Alchoran.

Or, as he expresses it himself, *p. 55.*

That a Turk according to me is a Christian, for I make the same Faith serve them both.

And

And particularly to shew where 'tis
I say,

XXIII.

*That Christ is not above the Nature
of a Man, or have made that a
necessary Article of the Chri-
stian Faith.*

And next where it is,

XXIV.

*That I speak as meanly of Christ's
Suffering on the Cross, and Death,
as if there were no such thing?*

For thus he says of me, p. 54. *I
seem to have consulted the Mahometan
Bible, which did say Christ did not
suffer on the Cross, did not Die. For
I, and my Allies, speak as meanly of
these Articles, as if there were no such
thing.*

To shew our Unmasker's Veracity in
this case, I shall trouble my Reader
with some Passages out of my *Rea-
sonableness of Christianity*, pag. 61.
“ When

“ When we consider that he was to
 “ fill out the time foretold of his
 “ Ministry, and after a life illustrious
 “ in Miracles, and good Works, at-
 “ tended with Humility, Meekness,
 “ Patience and *SUFFERING*, and
 “ every way conformable to the Pro-
 “ phecies of him, should be led as a
 “ Sheep to the *Slaughter*; and with
 “ all quiet and submission be brought
 “ to the *CROSS*, though there
 “ were no Guilt or Fault found in
 “ him”. And p. 74. “ Contrary to
 “ the design of his coming, which
 “ was to be *OFFER'D* up a Lamb
 “ blameless and void of offence”. And
 p. 116. *Laying down his life*, both for
Jews and Gentiles. P. 178. Given up to
Contempt, Torment and Death. But say
 what I will, when the *Unmasker* thinks
 fit to have it so, it is speaking out of
 the *Mahometan Bible*, That *Christ did*
not suffer on the Cross, did not Die;
 or at least, is speaking as meanly of
 these Articles, as if no such thing had
 been.

His next Slander is, p. 55. in these
 words; *This Gentleman presents the*
World with a very ill notion of Faith,
 for

for the very Devils are capable of all that Faith, which he says makes a Christian. It is not strange, that the Unmasker should misrepresent the Faith, which I say makes a Christian ; when it seems to be his whole Design to misrepresent my meaning every where. The frequency of his doing it, I have shew'd in abundance of instances, to which I shall add an eminent one here ; which shews what a fair Champion he is for Truth and Religion.

Page 196. of my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, I give this account of the Faith, which makes a Christian ; That it is “ Mens entring themselves in the
 “ Kingdom of God ; owning and professing themselves the Subjects of
 “ Jesus, whom they believe to be the
 “ *Messiah*, and receive for their Lord
 “ and King : For that was to be baptized in his Name”. This sense of believing Christ to be the *Messiah*, that is to take him for our King and Lord, who is to be obey'd, I have expressed over and over again ; as p. 209. my words are, “ That as many of them,
 “ as would believe Jesus the Son of
 “ God (whom he sent into the World)
 “ to

“ to be the Messiah the promised Deli-
 “ verer, and would receive him for
 “ their King and Ruler, should have
 “ all their past Sins, Disobedience, and
 “ Rebellion forgiven them”. And if
 “ for the future they lived in sincere
 “ Obedience to his Law, to the utmost
 “ of their Power, the Sins of humane
 “ frailty for the time to come, as
 “ well as those of their past lives,
 “ should for his Son’s sake, because
 “ they gave themselves up to him to
 “ be his Subjects, be forgiven them;
 “ And so their Faith, which made
 “ them be baptized into his Name
 “ (i. e. enroll themselves in the King-
 “ dom of *Jesus the Messiah*, and pro-
 “ fess themselves his Subjects; and
 “ consequently live by the Laws of
 “ his Kingdom) should be accounted
 “ to them for Righteousness”. Which
 Account of what is necessary, I close
 with these words : “ This is the
 “ *FAITH* for which God of his
 “ free Grace Justifies sinful Man. And
 is this the *Faith* of Devils ?

To the same purpose, p. 214. are
 these words. “ The chief End of his
 “ coming was to be a King, and as
 “ such

“ such to be received by those, who
 “ would be his Subjects in the King-
 “ dom, which he came to erect. And
 again, *p.* 212. “ Only those, who
 “ have believed Jesus to be the *Mes-*
 “ *siah*, and taken him for their King”,
 “ with a sincere endeavour after righ-
 “ teousness in obeying his Law, shall
 “ have their past Sins not imputed to
 “ them”. And so again, *p.* 213. and
 227. and in several other places: Of
 which I shall add but this one more,
 “ *p.* 228. “ ’Tis not enough to be-
 “ lieve him to be the *Messiah*, unless
 “ we obey his Laws, and take him
 “ to be our King to reign over us”.
 Can the Devils thus believe him to be
 the *Messiah*? Yet this is that which
 by these, and abundance of other
 places, I have shew’d to be the mean-
 ing of believing him to be the *Mes-*
siah.

Besides, I have expressly distinguish’d
 the Faith which makes a Christian,
 from that which the Devils have; by
 proving, that to the believing Jesus
 to be the *Messiah* must be join’d re-
 pentance, or else it will not make them
 true Christians; And what this repen-
 tance

tance is, may be seen at large in p. 193, &c. some Expressions whereof I shall here set down: As p. 198.

“ Repentance does not consist in one
“ single Act of Sorrow (though that
“ being first, and leading, gives Deno-
“ mination to the whole), but in do-
“ ing Works meet for Repentance; in
“ a sincere Obedience to the Law of
“ *Christ* the remainder of our Lives.

Again: To distinguish the Faith of a *Christian* from that of Devils, I say expressly out of St. *Paul's* Epistle to the *Galatians*, “ That which availeth is
“ *Faith*, but *Faith* working by *Love* ;
“ and that *Faith* without Works, *i. e.*
“ the Works of sincere Obedience to
“ the Law and Will of *Christ*, is not
“ sufficient for our Justification”.

And p. 222. “ That to inherit eternal
“ Life, we must love the Lord our
“ God, with all our Heart, with all
“ our Soul, with all our Strength,
“ and with all our Mind ; And 230.
“ Love *Christ* in keeping his Com-
“ mandments.

This, and a great deal more to this purpose, may be seen in my *Reasonableness of Christianity* ; particularly
N where

where I answer that Objection about the Faith of Devils, which I handle from *p. 193.* to *p. 251.* and therein at large shew wherein the Faith of Devils comes short of the Justifying Faith, which makes a Christian. And yet the good, the sincere, the candid *Unmasker*, with his becoming Confidence, tells his Readers here, *p. 55.* *That I present the World with a very ill notion of Faith: For the very Devils are capable of all that Faith, which I say makes a Christian Man.*

To prevent this Calumny, I in more places than one distinguished between Faith in a strict sense, as it is a bare assent to any Proposition, and that which is called Evangelical Faith, in a larger sense of the word; which comprehends under it something more than a bare simple assent, as *p. 43.*

“ I mean this is all is required to be
 “ *believed* by those who acknowledge
 “ but one Eternal invisible God, the
 “ Maker of Heaven and Earth.: For
 “ that there is something more requi-
 “ red to Salvation, besides *believing*
 “ we shall see hereafter”. *P. 47.* “ All
 “ I say that was to be believed for
 “ Justi

“ Justification. For that this was not
 “ all that was required to be done for
 “ Justification, we shall see hereafter ”.

P. 92. “ Obeying the Law of the
 “ *Messiah* their King being no less re-
 “ quired than their *believing* that Je-
 “ *sus* was the *Messiah*, the King and
 “ Deliverer, that was promised them ”,

Pag. 192. “ As far as *meer believing*
 “ could make them Members of
 “ *Christ's Body* ”. By these, and more
 the like Passages in my Book, my
 meaning is so evident, that no body,
 but an *Unmasker*, would have said, that
 when I spoke of *believing* as a bare
 Speculative assent to any Proposition
 as true, I affirm'd that was all that
 was required of a Christian for Justi-
 fication: Though that in the strict sense
 of the word is all that is done in *be-
 lieving*. And therefore, I say, as far
 as *meer believing* could make them
 Members of *Christ's Body*; plainly sig-
 nifying, as much as words can, that
 the *Faith*, for which they were justi-
 fied, included something more than
 a bare assent. This appears not only
 from these words of mine, p. 196.
St. Paul often in his Epistles, puts Faith

for the whole Duty of a Christian; but from my so often, and almost everywhere interpreting *believing him to be the Messiah*, by taking him to be our King; whereby is meant not a bare idle Speculation, a bare notional persuasion of any truth whatsoever floating in our Brains; but an active Principle of Life, a *Faith* working by Love and Obedience. To take him to be our King, carries with it a right disposition of the will to honour, and obey him, joyn'd to that assent wherewith Believers imbrace this Fundamental Truth, that Jesus was the Person, who was by God sent to be their King; he that was promis'd to be their Prince and Saviour.

But for all this, the *Unmasker*, p.56. Confidently tells his Reader that I say no such thing. His words are, *But besides this Historical Faith (as it is generally call'd by Divines) which is giving Credit to Evangelical Truths, as barely reveal'd, there must be something else added to make up the true Substantial Faith of a Christian. With the assent of the Understanding, must be joyn'd the consent or approbation of the Will.*

Will. All those Divine Truths, which the Intellect assents to must be allow'd of by this Elective Power of the Soul. True Evangelical Faith is a hearty acceptance of the Messias, as he is offer'd in the Gospel. It is a sincere and impartial submission to all things requir'd by the Evangelical Law which is contain'd in the Epistles as well as the other Writings. And to this practical assent and choice there must be added likewise a firm Trust and reliance in the blessed Author of our Salvation. But this late Undertaker who attempted to give us a more perfect account than ever was before of Christianity, as it is deliver'd in the Scriptures, brings us no tidings of any such Faith belonging to Christianity, or discover'd to us in the Scriptures. Which gives us to understand that he verily believes there is no such Christian Faith, for in some of his numerous Pages (especially 191. and 192, &c.) where he speaks so much of Belief and Faith, he might have taken occasion to insert one word about this compleat Faith of the Gospel.

Though the places above quoted out of my Reasonableness of Christianity,

nity, and the whole tenor of the latter part of it, shew the falshood of what the *Unmasker* here says; Yet I will set down one Passage more out of it, and then ask our *Unmasker*, when he hath read them, whether he hath the brow to say again, that *I bring no tidings of any such Faith?* My words are *Reasonableness of Christianity*, p. 244. “Faith in the Promises of
 “God, relying and acquiescing in his
 “Word and Faithfulness, the Almighty
 “takes well at our hands, as a great
 “mark of Homage, paid by us poor
 “frail Creatures to his Goodness and
 “Truth, as well as to his Power and
 “Wisdom; and accepts it as an Ac-
 “knowledgment of his peculiar Pro-
 “vidence and Benignity to us. And
 “therefore our Saviour tells us, *John*
 “*XII. 44. He that believes on me be-*
 “*lieves not on me, but on him that sent*
 “*me.* The Works of Nature shew
 “his Wisdom and Power: But ’tis
 “his peculiar care of Mankind, most
 “eminently discover’d in his Promi-
 “ses to them, that shews his Bounty
 “and Goodness; And consequently
 “engages their Hearts in Love and
 “Affe-

“ Affection to him. This oblation of
 “ an heart fixed with dependance and
 “ affection on him, is the most ac-
 “ ceptable Tribute we can pay him;
 “ the Foundation of true Devotion;
 “ and Life of all Religion. What a
 “ Value he puts on this depending on
 “ his Word, and resting satisfied on
 “ his Promises, we have an example
 “ in *Abraham*; whose Faith was coun-
 “ ted to him for Righteousness; As
 “ we have before remarked out of
 “ *Rom. IV.* and his relying firmly on
 “ the Promise of God, without any
 “ doubt of its Performance; gave
 “ him the Name, of the Father of
 “ the Faithful; And gained him so
 “ much favour with the Almighty,
 “ that he was called the Friend of
 “ God: The Highest and most Glo-
 “ rious Title can be bestowed on a
 “ Creature”.

The great out-cry he makes against
 me in his two next Sections, *p. 57.--60.*
 as if I intended to introduce Ignorance
 and Popery, is to be entertain'd rather
 as the noise of a petulant Scold, saying
 the worst things she could think of,
 than as the arguing of a Man of

sense or sincerity. All this mighty Accusation is grounded upon these Falshoods, That *I make it my great business to beat Men off from Divine Truths*; That *I cry down all Articles of the Christian Faith but one*; That *I will not suffer Men to look into Christianity*; That *I blast the Epistolary Writings*. I shall add no more to what I have already said about the Epistles, but those few words out of my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, p. 295. “ The
 “ Epistles resolving Doubts, and re-
 “ forming Mistakes, are of great Ad-
 “ vantage to our Knowledge and Pra-
 “ ctise”. And p. 229. “ An explicit
 “ belief of what God requires of those,
 “ who will enter into, and receive the
 “ benefits of the New Covenant, is
 “ absolutely required. The other parts
 “ of Divine Revelation are Objects of
 “ Faith, and are so to be received.
 “ They are Truths whereof none
 “ that is once known to be such [*i. e.*
 “ of Divine Revelation] may or ought
 “ to be disbelieved.

And as for that other Saying of his,
That I will not suffer Men to look into Christianity; I desire to know where
 that

that Christianity is locked up, which *I will not suffer Men to look into.* My Christianity, I confess, is contain'd in the written Word of God : And that I am so far from hindring any one to look into, that I every where appeal to it, and have quoted so much of it, that the *Unmasker* complains of being overlaid with it, and tells me 'tis *tedious*. " All Divine Revelation, I say, " *p. 300.* requires the Obedience of " Faith ; And that every one is to receive all the parts of it, with a docility and disposition prepar'd to imbrace and assent to all Truths coming from God ; and submit his Mind to whatever shall appear to him to bear that Character". I speak in the next Page of Mens *endeavouring* to understand it, and of their *interpreting* one place by another. This and the whole Design of my Book shews, That I think it every Christian's Duty to read, search, and study the Holy Scriptures ; and make this their great Business : And yet the good *Unmasker* in a fit of Zeal displays his Throat, and crys out, *p. 59.* *Hear O ye Heavens, and give ear, O Earth,*
judge

judge whether this be not the way to introduce Darknefs and Ignorance into Christendom; whether this be not blinding of Mens Eyes, &c. For this mighty Pathos ends not there. And all things consider'd, I know not whether he had not reason, in his want of Arguments, this way to pour out his concern. For neither the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles, nor the Apostles Creed, nor any thing else being with him the Faith of a Christian, i. e. sufficient to make a Christian, but just his set of Fundamental Articles (when he himself knows what they be) In fine, nothing being Christianity but just his System, 'tis time to cry out, Help Neighbours, hold fast Friends; Knowledge, Religion, Christianity is gone, if this be once permitted, that the People should read and understand the Scripture for themselves, as God shall enlighten their Understandings in the use of the means; and not be forced to depend upon me, and upon my choosing, and my Interpretation, for the necessary Points they are to believe to make them Christians: If I the great Un-
masker,

masker, have not the sole Power to decree, what is, or is not Fundamental, and People be not bound to receive it for such, Faith and the Gospel are given up; *Darkness* and *Barbarism* will be brought in upon us by this *Writer's Contrivance*. For, *he is an under-hand Factor for that Communion, which cries up ignorance for the Mother of Devotion and Religion*, i. e. in plain English for Popery. For to this and nothing else tends all that sputter he makes in the Sections before mention'd.

I do not think there was ever a more through-paced Declaimer than our *Unmasker*. He leaves out nothing that he thinks will make an affrighting noise in the Ears of his Orthodox Hearers, though all the blame and censure he pours out upon others, light only on himself. For let me ask this Zealous Upholder of Light and Knowledge, does he think it reasonable that any one, who is not a Christian, should be suffer'd to be undisturb'd in his Parish? Nay, does he think fit, that any such should live free from the *Lash of the Magistrate*,
or

or from the Persecution of the *Ecclesiastical Power*? He seems to talk with another Air, *p. 65*. In the next place, I ask, whether any one is a Christian who hath not the Faith of a Christian? Thirdly, I ask, whether he has the Faith of a Christian, who does not explicitly believe all the Fundamental Articles of Christianity? And to conclude, I ask him, whether all those that he has set down are not Fundamental necessary Articles? When the *Unmasker* has fairly answer'd these Questions, it will be seen who is for Popery, and the Ignorance and Tyranny that accompanies it.

The *Unmasker* is for making and imposing Articles of Faith: But he is for this Power in himself. He likes not Popery (which is nothing but the Tyranny and imposing upon Mens Understandings, Faith, and Consciences) in the hands of the old Gentleman at *Rome*: But it would, he thinks, do admirably well in his own hands. And who can blame him for it? Would not that be an excellent way to propagate *Light and Knowledge*, by tying up all Men to a bundle of Articles of his own culling?

culling? Or rather to the Authority of Christ and his Apostles residing in him? For he does not, nor ever will, give us a full view of Fundamentals of his Christianity: But like the Church of *Rome*, to secure our Dependance, reserves to himself a Power of declaring others, and defining what is Matter of Faith, as he shall see occasion.

Now therefore vail your Bonnets to the *Unmasker*, all you that have a Mind to be Christians: Break not your Heads about the Scriptures, to examine what they require of you: Submit your Faith implicitly to the *Unmasker*, he will understand and find out the necessary Points for you to believe. Take them, just so many as he thinks fit to deliver them to you: This is the way to be knowing Christians. But be sure, ask not whether those he is pleas'd to deliver be every one of them Fundamental, and all the fundamental Articles necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian: Such a *capricious* Question spoils all; Overturns Christianity, which is intrusted to the *Unmasker's* sole keeping, to be dispensed out as he thinks fit. If
you

you refuse an implicit Faith to him, he will presently find you have it for the whore of *Babylon*; he will smell out Popery in it immediately: For he has a very shrewd Scent, and you will be discover'd to be an *Underhand Factor* for the Church of *Rome*.

But if the *Unmasker* were such an Enemy, as he pretends, to those *Factors*; I wonder he should, in what he has said concerning the Apostles Creed, so exactly jump with *Knot* the Jesuit. If any one doubt of this, I desire him to look into the Fourth Chapter of *Knot's Charity maintain'd*, and there he will see, how well our *Unmasker* and that *Jesuit* agree in Argument; nay, and Expressions too. But yet I do not think him so far guilty, as to be imployed as an *Underhand Factor* for Popery. Every Body will, I suppose, be ready to pronounce him so far an Innocent, as to clear him from that. The Cunning of his Design goes not beyond the laying out of his preaching Oratory, for the setting up his own System; and making that the sole Christianity. To that end, he would be glad to have the Power of
inter-

interpreting Scripture, of defining and declaring Articles of Faith, and imposing them. This which makes the absolute Power of the Pope he would not I think establish at *Rome*; but 'tis plain he would have it himself, if he could get it, for the Support of the Christianity of his System. An implicit Faith, if he might have the Management of it, and the taking Fundamentals upon Trust from his Authority, would be of excellent Use. Such a Power in his Hands, would spread *Truth* and *Knowledge* in the World, i. e. his own Orthodoxy, and Set of Opinions. But if a Man differs, nay, questions any thing of that, whether it be absolutely necessary to make one a Christian, 'tis immediately a *Contrivance* to let in Popery, and to bring *Darkness* and *Barbarism* into the *Christian World*. But I must tell the Innocent *Unmasker*, whether he designs it or no, That if his calling his System the only Christianity, can bring the World to receive from him Articles of Faith of his own chusing, as Fundamentals necessary to be believed by all Men to make them Christians, which Christ
and

and his Apostles did not propose to all Men to make them Christians, he does only set up *Popery* in another Guise, and lay the Foundations of *Ignorance, Darknes, and Barbarism*, in the Christian World. For all the *Ignorance* and *Blindness*, that *Popery* introduced, was only upon this Foundation. And if he does not see this (as there is Reason to excuse his Innocence) 'twould be no hard matter to demonstrate it; If that were at present the Question between us. But there are a great many other Propositions to be proved by him, before we come to that new Matter of Debate.

But before I quit these Paragraphs, I must go on with our *Unmasker's* Account, and desire him to shew where it is

XXV.

*That I make it my Business to beat
Men off from taking notice of any
Divine Truths?*

Next

Next, where it is

XXVI.

That I cry down all Articles of Christian Faith but one ?

Next, how it appears

XXVII.

That I will not suffer Mankind to look into Christianity ?

Again, where it is

XXVIII.

That I labour industriously to keep People in Ignorance; Or tell them, That there is no necessity of knowing any other Doctrines of the Bible ?

These and several others of the like strain, particularly concerning *One Article*, and the *Epistles*; (which are his common places) are to be found in his 59. and 60. Pages. And all this out of a Presumption, that his System is

O the

the only Christianity; And that if Men were not pressed, and perswaded to receive that, just every Article of it, upon pain of Damnation; Christianity would be lost: And not to do this, is to promote *Ignorance*, and condemn the Bible. But he fears where no fear is. If his Orthodoxy be the truth, and conformable to the Scriptures, the laying the Foundation only where our Saviour and his Apostles have laid it, will not overturn it. And to shew him, that it is so, I desire him again to consider what I said in p. 8. of my *Vindication*: Which, because I do not remember, he any where takes notice of in his Reply, I will here offer again to his consideration: “Con-
 “ vince but Men of the Mission of
 “ Jesus Christ; make them but see
 “ the Truth, Simplicity and Reasona-
 “ bleness of what he himself hath
 “ taught, and required to be belie-
 “ ved by his Followers, and you need
 “ not doubt, but being once fully per-
 “ swaded of his Doctrine and the Ad-
 “ vantages, which all Christians agree
 “ are received by him, such Converts
 “ will not lay by the Scriptures; But
 “ by

“ by a constant reading and study of
“ them, will get all the Light they
“ can from this Divine Revelation;
“ and nourish themselves up in the
“ words of Faith and good Doctrine,
“ as *St. Paul* speaks to *Timothy*”.

If the reading and study of the Scripture were more pressed than it is, and Men were fairly sent to the Bible to find their Religion; and not the Bible put into their hands only to find the Opinions of their peculiar Sect or Party, Christendom would have more Christians, and those that are, would be more knowing, and more in the right than now they are. That which hinders this, is that select bundle of Doctrines, which it has pleased every Sect to draw out of the Scriptures, or their own inventions, with an Omision (and as our *Unmasker* would say, a *Contempt*) of all the rest. These choice Truths (as the *Unmasker* calls his) are to be the standing Orthodoxy of that Party, from which none of that Church must recede without the forfeiture of their Christianity, and the loss of eternal Life. But whilst People keep firm to these, they are in

the Church, and the Way to Salvation. Which in effect, what is it but to incourage ignorance, laziness, and neglect of the Scriptures? For what need they be at the pains of constantly reading the Bible? Or perplex their Heads with considering and weighing what is there deliver'd, when believing as the Church believes, or saying after, or not contradicting their *Domine*, or Teacher, serves the turn?

Further, I desire it may be consider'd what Name that meer Mock-shew of recommending to Men the study of the Scripture deserves; if, when they read it, they must understand it just as he (that would be, and they are too apt, contrary to the Command of Christ, to call their Master) tells them. If they find any thing in the Word of God, that leads them into Opinions, that he does not allow; If any thing they meet with in Holy Writ seems to them to thwart or shake the received Doctrines, the very proposing of their Doubts renders them suspected: Reasoning about them, and not acquiescing in what ever is said to them, is interpreted
want

want of due respect and deference to the Authority of their Spiritual Guides: Disrepute and Censures follow: And if in pursuance of their own Light, they persist in what they think the Scripture teaches them, they are turn'd out of the Church, deliver'd to Sathan, and no longer allow'd to be Christians. And is thus a sincere and rightly directed study of the Scriptures, that Men may understand and profit thereby, encouraged? This is the Consequence of Mens assuming to themselves a Power of declaring Fundamentals, *i.e.* of setting up a Christianity of their own making. For how else can they turn Men, of as unblameable Lives as others of their Members, out of the Church of Christ (for so they count their Communion) for Opinions, unless those Opinions were concluded inconsistent with Christianity? Thus Systems, the Inventions of Men, are turn'd into so many opposite Gospels; and nothing is truth in each Sect, but what just suits with them. So that the Scripture serves but like a Nose of Wax, to be turn'd and bent, just as

A Second Vindication of the

may fit the contrary Orthodoxies of different Societies. For 'tis these several Systems that to each Party are the just Standards of Truth, and the meaning of the Scripture is to be measur'd only by them. Whoever relinquishes any of those distinguishing Points, immediately ceases to be a Christian.

This is the Way that the *Unmasker* would have Truth and Religion preserv'd, Light and Knowledge propagated. But here too the differing Sects giving equal Authority to their own Orthodoxies will be quits with him. For as far as I can observe, the same Genius seems to influence them all; even those who pretend most to freedom, the *Socinians* themselves. For when it is observed how positive and eager they are in their Disputes; how forward to have their Interpretations of Scripture received for Authentick, though to others in several places they seem very much strain'd; How impatient they are of Contradiction; and with what disrespect and roughness they often treat their Opposers; May it not be suspected that this so visible warmth in their present Circum-

Circumstances, and Zeal for their Orthodoxy, would (had they the Power) work in them, as it does in others? They in their turns would I fear be ready, with their Set of Fundamentals; which they would be as forward to impose on others, as others have been to impose contrary Fundamentals on them.

This is and always will be the unavoidable effect of intruding on our Saviour's Authority, and requiring more now as necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, than was at first required by our Saviour and his Apostles. What else can be expected among Christians, but their tearing, and being torn in pieces by one another; whilst every Sect assumes to it self a Power of declaring Fundamentals, and severally thus narrow Christianity to their distinct Systems? He that has a mind to see how Fundamentals come to be fram'd and fashion'd, and upon what Motives and Considerations they are often taken up, or laid down, according to the Humours, Interests, or Designs of the Heads of Parties, as if they were things

O 4 depending

depending on Mens pleasure, and to be suited to their convenience, may find an Example worth his notice, in the Life of Mr. *Baxter*, Part II. p.197.

---205.

Whenever Men take upon them to go beyond those Fundamental Articles of Christianity, which are to be found in the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apostles, where will they stop? Whenever any Set of Men will require more as necessary to be believed to make Men of their Church, *i.e.* in their sense Christians, than what our Saviour and his Apostles propos'd to those, whom they made Christians, and admitted into the Church of Christ; however they may pretend to recommend the Scripture to their People, in effect no more of it is recommended to them, than just comports with what the Leaders of that Sect have resolv'd Christianity shall consist in.

'Tis no wonder therefore there is so much Ignorance amongst Christians, and so much vain outcry against it; whilst almost every distinct Society of Christians Magisterially ascribes Orthodoxy

thodoxy to a select Set of Fundamentals distinct from those proposed in the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles, which in no one Point must be question'd by any of its Communion. By this means their People are never sent to the Holy Scriptures, that true Fountain of Light, but hood-wink'd : A Veil is cast over their eyes, and then they are bid read the Bible. They must make it all chime to their Churches Fundamentals, or else they were better let it alone. For if they find any thing there against the received Doctrines, though they hold it and express it, in the very terms the Holy Ghost has deliver'd it in, that will not excuse them. Heresie will be their lot, and they shall be treated accordingly. And thus we see how, amongst other good effects, Creed-making always has, and always will necessarily produce and propagate Ignorance in the World, however each Party blame others for it. And therefore, I have often wonder'd to hear Men of several Churches so heartily exclaim against the implicit Faith of the Church of *Rome* ; when the same
implicit

implicit Faith is as much practised and required in their own, though not so openly professed, and ingenuously owned there.

In the next Section, the *Unmasker* questions the Sincerity of mine, and professes the greatness of his concern *for the Salvation of Mens Souls*. And tells me of my *Reflection* on him upon that account, in the 9th. Page of my *Vindication*. *Answ.* I wish he would for the right Information of the Reader every where set down, what he has any thing to say to in my Book, or my Defence of it, and save me the Labour of repeating it. My words in that place are, “ Some Men will not
 “ bear, that any one should speak of
 “ Religion, but according to the Mo-
 “ del, that they themselves have made
 “ of it. Nay, though he proposes it
 “ upon the very terms, and in the
 “ very words, which our Saviour and
 “ his Apostles preach’d it in ; yet he
 “ shall not escape Censures and the
 “ severest insinuations. To deviate
 “ in the least, or to omit any thing
 “ contained in their Articles is Heresy,
 “ under the most invidious Names
 “ in

“ in fashion ; and ’tis well if he escapes
 “ being a downright Atheist. Whe-
 “ ther this be the Way for Teachers
 “ to make themselves hearken’d to as
 “ Men in Earnest in Religion, and
 “ really concern’d for the Salvation
 “ of Mens Souls I leave them to con-
 “ sider. What Success it has had to-
 “ wards perswading Men of the truth
 “ of Christianity, their own Com-
 “ plaints of the prevalency of Athe-
 “ ism on the one hand, and the num-
 “ ber of *Deists* on the other sufficient-
 “ ly shew.

I have set down this Passage at large, both as a confirmation of what I said but just now ; as also to shew, that the *Reflection*, I there made, needed some other Answer than a bare Profession of his *regard to the Salvation of Mens Souls*. The assuming an undue Authority to his own Opinions, and using manifest Untruths in the defence of them, I am sure is no mark that the directing Men right in the way to Salvation is his chief aim. And I wish, that the greater Liberties of that sort, which he has again taken in his *Socinianism Unmask’d*, and which
 I have

I have so often laid open, had not confirm'd that *Reflection*. I should have been glad, that any thing in my Book had been fairly controverted, and brought to the touch, whether it had or had not been confuted. The matter of it would have deserved a serious debate (if any had been necessary) in the words of Sobriety and the Charitable temper of the Gospel, as I desired in my Preface: And that would not have mis-become the *Unmasker's* Function. But it did not consist, it seems, with his Design. Christian Charity would not have allow'd those ill-meant Conjectures, and groundless Censures, which were necessary to his purpose; and therefore he took a shorter course, than to confute my Book, and thereby convince me and others. He makes it his business to rail at it, and the Author of it; that that might be taken for a confutation. For, by what he has hitherto done, arguing seems not to be his Talent. And thus far who can but allow his Wisdom? But whether it be that *Wisdom that is from above, first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easie to be intreated,*

intreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisie, I shall leave to other Readers to judge.

His saying nothing to that other *Reflection*, which his manner of expressing himself drew from me, would make one suspect it favoured not altogether of the Wisdom of the Gospel; nor shew'd an over great Care of the Salvation of Souls. My Words, *Vindic.* p. 25. are “ I know not how
 “ better to shew my Care of his Cre-
 “ dit, than by intreating him, that
 “ when he takes next in hand such a
 “ Subject as this, wherein the Salva-
 “ tion of Souls is concerned, he would
 “ treat it a little more seriously, and
 “ with a little more Candour; lest
 “ Men should find in his Writings
 “ another Cause of Atheism, which
 “ in this Treatise he has not thought
 “ fit to mention. *Ostentation of Wit*
 “ in General, he has made a Cause of
 “ Atheism, p. 28. But the World
 “ will tell him; That frothy light
 “ Discourses concerning the serious
 “ Matters of Religion, and *Ostentation*
 “ of trifling mis-becoming Wit, in
 “ those

“ those who come as Ambassadors
 “ from God, under the title of Suc-
 “ cessors of the Apostles in the great
 “ Commission of the Gospel, is none
 “ of the least Causes of Atheism”.
 But this advice I am now satisfied (by
 his Second Part of the same Strain)
 was very improper for him; and no
 more reasonable, than if one should
 advise a Buffoon to talk gravely; who
 has nothing left to draw attention, if
 he should lay by his scurrility.

The remainder of this 4th. Chapter,
p. 61.---67. being spent in shewing,
 why the *Socinians* are for a few Arti-
 cles of Faith, being a Matter that I
 am not concern'd in; I leave to that
 forward Gentleman to examine, who
 examined Mr. *Edwards's* Exceptions
 against the *Reasonableness of Christia-*
nity; and who, as the *Unmasker* in-
 forms me, *p. 64.* was *chosen to vindi-*
cate my attempt, &c.

If the *Unmasker* knows that he was
 so *Chosen*, it is well. If I had known
 of such a choice, I should have desi-
 red that somebody should have been
chosen to Vindicate my attempt, who
 had understood it better. The *Un-*
masker

masker and *Examiner* are each of them so full of themselves, and their own Systems, that I think they may be a fit match one for another; And so I leave these Cocks of the Game, to try it out in an endless battle of wrangling (till Death them depart) which of them has made the true and exact Collection of Fundamentals; And whose System of the two ought to be the prevailing Orthodoxy, and be received for Scripture. Only I warn the *Examiner* to look to himself; For the *Unmasker* has the whiphand of him, and gives him to understand, p. 65. that if he cannot do it himself by the strength of his Lungs, the vehemency of his Oratory, and endless attacks of his Repetitions, the *Ecclesiastical Power*, and the *Civil Magistrates lash* have in store demonstrative Arguments to convince him that his [the *Unmasker's*] System is the only true Christianity.

By the way, I must not forget to mind the *Unmasker* here again, that he hath a very unlucky hand at guessing. For, whereas he names *Socinus* as one from whom I received my
Plat-

Platform, and says that *Crellius* gave me my *Kue*; it so falls out, that they are two Authors of whom I never read a Page. I say not this, as if I thought it a fault if I had, for I think I should have much better spent my time in them, than in the Writings of our learned *Unmasker*.

I was sure there was no offending the *Unmasker* without the guilt of *Atheism*; only he here, p. 69. very mercifully lays it upon my Book, and not upon my Design. *The tendency of it to Irreligion and Atheism*, he has proved in an Eloquent Harangue (for he is such an Orator he cannot stir a foot without a Speech) made as he bids us suppose by the *Atheistical Rabble*. And who can deny, but he has chose a fit Employment for himself? Where could there be found a better Speech-maker for the *Atheistical Rabble*? But let us hear him: For though he would give the *Atheistical Rabble* the Credit of it, yet 'tis the *Unmasker* speaks. And because 'tis pity such a pattern of Rhetorick and Reason should be lost, I have for my Reader's Edification, set it all down *verbatim*.

“ We

“ We are beholding to this worthy
“ Adventurer for ridding the World
“ of so great an Incumbrance, *viz.*
“ That huge Mass and unweildy Body
“ of Christianity, which took up so
“ much room. Now we see that it
“ was this bulk and not that of Man-
“ kind which he had an eye to, when
“ he so often mention'd this latter.
“ This is a Physician for our turn in-
“ deed : We like this Chymical Ope-
“ rator that doth not trouble us with
“ a parcel of heavy Drugs of no value,
“ but contracts it all into a few Spi-
“ rits, nay doth his business with a
“ single drop. We have been in bon-
“ dage a long time to Creeds and
“ Catechisms, Systems and Confes-
“ sions; we have been plagued with a
“ tedious Beadroll of Articles, which
“ our Reverend Divines have told us
“ we must make the Matter of our
“ Faith. Yea, so it is, both Confor-
“ mists and Nonconformists (though
“ disagreeing in some other things)
“ have agreed in this to molest and
“ Crucifie us. But this noble Writer
“ (we thank him) hath set us free;
“ and eas'd us by bringing down all

P.

“ the

“ the Christian Faith into one Point.
“ We have heard some Men talk of
“ Epistolary Composures of the New
“ Testament, as if great Matters were
“ contain’d in them, as if the great
“ Mysteries of Christianity (as they
“ call them) were unfolded there :
“ But we could never make any thing
“ of them; and now we find that this
“ Writer is partly of our Opinion.
“ He tells us that these are Letters
“ sent upon occasion, but we are not
“ to look for our Religion (for now
“ for this Gentleman’s sake we begin
“ to talk of Religion) in these places.
“ We believe it, and we believe that
“ there is no Religion but in those
“ very Chapters and Verses, which
“ he has set down in his Treatise.
“ What need we have any other part
“ of the New Testament ? That is
“ Bible enough, if not too much.
“ Happy, thrice happy shall this Au-
“ thor be perpetually esteemed by us,
“ we will Chronicle him as our Friend
“ and Benefactor. It is not our way
“ to Saint People : Otherwise we
“ would certainly canonize this Gen-
“ tleman ; and when our hand is in,
“ his

“ his pair of Booksellers for their be-
 “ ing so Beneficial to the World in
 “ publishing so rich a Treasure. It
 “ was a blessed day when this hope-
 “ ful Birth saw the Light, for hereby
 “ all the Orthodox Creed-Makers and
 “ Systematick Men are ruined for
 “ ever. In brief, if we be for any
 “ Christianity, it shall be this Au-
 “ thor’s; for that agrees with us sin-
 “ gularly well, it being so short, all
 “ couch’d in four words neither more
 “ nor less. It is a very fine Compen-
 “ dium, and we are infinitely obliged
 “ to this great Reformer for it. We
 “ are glad at heart that Christianity
 “ is brought so low by this worthy
 “ Pen-man, for this is a good presage
 “ that it will dwindle into nothing.
 “ What ! But one Article, and that
 “ so brief too ! We like such a Faith,
 “ and such a Religion, because it is so
 “ near to none”.

He hath no sooner done, but as it
 deserved, he crys out, *Euge Sophos.*
And is not the Reader, quoth he, *satis-*
fied that such Language as this hath
real truth in it ? Does not he perceive,
that the discarding all the Articles

but ONE makes way for the casting off that too? Answ. 'Tis but supposing that the Reader is a civil Gentleman, and answers Yes, to these two Questions, and then 'tis Demonstration, that by this Speech he has irrefragably proved the tendency of my Book to Irreligion and Atheism.

I remember *Chillingworth* somewhere puts up this Request to his Adversary *Knot*: “ Sir, I beseech you, “ when you write again, do us the “ favour to write nothing but Syllo- “ gisms. For I find it still an extream “ trouble to find out the conceal’d “ Propositions, which are to connect “ the parts of your Enthymems. As “ now for Example, I profess to you “ I have done my best endeavour to “ find some Glue, or Sodder, or Ce- “ ment, or Thread, or any thing to “ tie the Antecedent and this Confe- “ quent together”. The *Unmasker* agrees so much in a great part of his Opinion with that Jesuit (as I have shew’d already) and does so infinitely out-doe him in spinning Ropes of Sand, and a course Thread of Inconsistencies, which runs quite through his

his Book, That 'tis with great justice, I put him here in the Jesuits place, and address the same Request to him.

His very next words give me a fresh reason to do it : For thus he argues. *p. 72. May we not expect, that those, who deal thus with the Creed, i. e. Discard all the Articles of it but one, will use the same Method in reducing the ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer, Abbreviate the former into one Precept, and the latter into one Petition?* Answ. If he will tell me where this *Creed*, he speaks of, is, it will be much more easie to answer his Demand. Whilst his *Creed*, which he here speaks of, is yet no where, it is ridiculous for him to ask Questions about it. The Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer, I know where to find, in express words set down by themselves, with peculiar marks of distinction. Which is the Lord's Prayer we are plainly taught, by this Command of our Saviour, *Luk. XI. 1. When we pray, SAY, Our Father, &c.* In the same manner and words we are taught what we should believe, to make us his Disciples by his Command to the Apostles what

P 3

they

they should Preach, *Mat. X. 7. As ye go preach SAYING.* What were they to say? Only this, *the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.* Or, as *St. Luke* expresses it, *IX. 2.* They were sent *to preach the Kingdom of God, and to heal the Sick;* Which, what it was we have sufficiently explain'd. But this *Creed* of the *Unmasker*, which he talks of, where is it? Let him shew it us distinctly set out from the rest of the Scripture. If he knows where it is, let him produce it, or leave talking of it, till he can. 'Tis not the Apostles Creed, that's evident. For that Creed he has *discarded* from being the Standard of Christian Faith, and has told the World in words at length, *That if a Man believes no more than is in express terms in the Apostles Creed, his Faith will not be the Faith of a Christian.* Nay, 'tis plain, that Creed has in the *Unmasker's* Opinion, the same tendency to *Atheism and Irreligion*, that my Summary has. For the Apostles Creed reducing the Forty, or perhaps Four hundred Fundamental Articles of his Christian Creed, to Twelve; and leaving out the greatest part of those

those necessary ones which he has already, and will hereafter in good time give us, does as much dispose Men to serve the Decalogue, and the Lord's Prayer just so; as my reducing those Twelve to Two. For so many at least he has granted to be in my Summary, *viz.* The Article of one God, Maker of Heaven and Earth, and the other of Jesus the Messiah; though he every where calls them but *ONE*: Which, whether it be to shew, with what love and regard to truth he continues, and consequently began this Controversie; or whether it be to beguile and startle unwary, or confirm prejudiced Readers, I shall leave to others to judge. 'Tis evident he thinks his Cause would be mightily maimed, if he were forced to leave out the charge of *ONE* Article; and he would not know what to do for Wit or Argument, if he should call them *two*. For then the whole weight and edge of his strong and sharp reasoning in his *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*, p. 122. would be lost. There you have it in these words; *When the Catholick Faith is thus brought*

A Second Vindication of the

down to one single Article, it will soon be reduced to none; the Unit will dwindle into a Cypher. And here again, it makes the whole Argument of his Atheistical Speech, which he winds up with these convincing words; We are glad to hear, that Christianity is brought so low by this worthy Pen-man; for this is a good Presage, that it will dwindle into nothing. What! ONE Article, and that so brief too: We like such a Faith and such a Religion, because it is so near NONE. But I must tell this Writer of equal Wit, Sense, and Modesty, That this Religion, which he thus makes a dull Farce of, and calls near none, is that very Religion, which our Saviour Jesus Christ and his Apostles preach'd for the Conversion and Salvation of Mankind; no one Article whereof, which they propos'd as necessary to be received by Unbelievers to make them Christians, is omitted. And I ask him, whether it be his Errand, as one of our Saviour's Ambassadors to turn it thus into Ridicule? For till he has shewn, that they Preach'd otherwise, and more than what the Spirit of Truth has recorded

corded of their Preaching in their Histories, which I have faithfully collected, and set down, all that he shall say reflecting upon the Plainness and Simplicity of their Doctrine, however directed against me, will by his *Atheistical Rabble* of all kinds, now they are so well enter'd and instructed in it by him, be all turn'd upon our Saviour and his Apostles.

What tendency this, and all his other trifling, in so serious a cause as this is, has to the propagating of *Atheism and Irreligion* in this Age, he were best to consider. This I am sure, the Doctrine of but *one* Article, (if the Author and finisher of our Faith, and those he guided by his Spirit, had Preach'd but *one* Article) has no more tendency to Atheism, than their Doctrine of *one* God. But the *Unmasker* every where talks, as if the Strength of our Religion lay in the number of its Articles; and would be presently routed, if it had but a few: And therefore he has mustered up a pretty full band of them, and has a reserve of the Lord knows how many more, which shall be forthcoming up-
on

on occasion. But I shall desire to mind this Learned Divine, who is so afraid what will become of his Religion, if it should propose but *one* or a few Articles as necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, that the Strength and Security of our Religion lies in the Divine Authority of those who first promulgated the terms of admittance into the Church, and not in the Multitude of Articles suppos'd by some necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian: And I would have him remember, when he goes next to make use of this strong Argument of *ONE dwindling into a Cypher*, that *One* is as remote as a Million from none. And if this be not so, I desire to know whether his way of arguing will not prove Pagan Polytheism to be more remote from Atheism than Christianity. He will do well to try the force of his Speech, in the Mouth of an Heathen, complaining of the tendency of *Christianity* to Atheism, by reducing his great number of Gods to but *one*, which was *so near none* and would therefore soon be reduced to none.

The

The *Unmasker* seems to be upon the same Topick where he so pathetically complains of the *Socinians*, p. 66. in these words. *Is it not enough to rob us of our God, by denying Christ to be so ; But, must they spoil us of all the other Articles of Christian Faith but one ?* Have a better heart, good Sir, for I assure you, nobody can rob you of *your God*, but by your own consent ; Nor *spoil* you of any of the *Articles* of your *Faith*. If you look for them where God has placed them, in the Holy Scripture ; and take them as he has framed and fashion'd them there ; there you will always find them safe and sound. But if they come out of an Artificer's Shop, and be of humane Invention, I cannot answer for them : They may, for ought I know , be nothing but an Idol of your own setting up ; which may be pull'd down, should you cry out never so much, *Great is Diana of the Ephesians*.

He, who considers this Argument of *one* and *none*, as managed by the *Unmasker*, and observes his Pathetical way of reasoning all through his Book, must confess, that he has got the very
Philo-

Philosopher's Stone in disputing. That which would be worthless Lead in others, he turns into pure Gold ; His Oratory changes its Nature, and gives it the noble Tincture : So that what in plain reasoning would be Nonsense, let him but put it into a Speech, or an Exclamation, and there it becomes strong Argument. Whether this be not so, I desire *Mode* and *Figure* may decide. And to those I shall desire he would reduce the Proofs, which *p. 73.* he says, he has given of these following Propositions, *viz.*

XXIX.

That I have corrupted Mens Minds.

XXX.

That I have depraved the Gospel.

XXXI.

That I have abused Christianity.

For all these three, *p. 73.* he affirms of me without Proof, and without Honesty. Whether

Whether it be from confusion of Thought, or unfairness of Design; either because he has not clear distinct notions of what he would say, or finds it not to his purpose to speak them clearly out, or both together; so it is, that the *Unmasker* very seldom, but when he rails, delivers himself so that one can certainly tell what he would have.

The Question is, what is absolutely necessary to be believed by every one to make him a Christian. It has been clearly made out from an exact Survey of the History of our Saviour and his Apostles, that the whole aim of all their Preaching every where was to convince the unbelieving World of these two great Truths. First, That there was one Eternal invisible God, Maker of Heaven and Earth; And next, That *Jesus of Nazareth* was the *Messiah*, the promised King, and Saviour. And that upon Mens believing these two Articles they were Baptized, and admitted into the Church, *i. e.* received as Subjects of Christ's Kingdom, and pronounced Believers. From whence it unavoidably follows, that
these

these two are the only Truths necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian.

This Matter of Fact is so evident from the whole tenor of the four Gospels, and the Acts ; And presses so hard, that the *Unmasker*, who contends for a great number of other Points necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, thinks himself concern'd to give some Answer to it: But in his usual way full of Uncertainty and Confusion. To clear this Matter, he lays down four Particulars. The First is, *p. 74. That the believing Jesus to be the promised Messiah, was the first step to Christianity.*

The Second, *p. 76. That though this one Proposition (viz. of Jesus the Messiah) be mentioned alone in some places, yet there is reason to think, and be persuaded, that at the same time other Matters of Faith were proposed.*

The Third, *p. 76. That though there are several Parts and Members of the Christian Faith, yet they do not all occur in any one place of Scripture.*

The Fourth, *p. 78. That Christianity was erected by degrees.*

These

These particulars he tells us, *p. 74.* he offers to clear an Objection. To see therefore whether they are pertinent or no, we must examine what the Objection is as he puts it. I think it might have been put in a few words: This I am sure, it ought to have been put very clear and distinct. But the *Unmasker* has been pleased to give it us, *p. 73.* as followeth. *Because I designed these Papers for the satisfying of the Reader's Doubts, about any thing occurring concerning the Matter before us, and for the establishing of his wavering Mind, I will here (before I pass to the Second general Head of my Discourse) answer a Query or Objection, which some and not without some shew of Ground may be apt to start. How comes it to pass, they will say, that this Article of Faith, viz. That Jesus is the Messiah or Christ, is so often repeated in the New Testament? Why is this sometimes urged without the mentioning of any other Article of Belief? Doth not this plainly shew that this is all that is requir'd to be believed as necessary to make a Man a Christian? May we not infer from the frequent and sole repetition*

A Second Vindication of the

tition of this Article in several places of the Evangelists and the Acts, that there is no other Point of Faith of absolute necessity ; but that this alone is sufficient to constitute a Man a true Member of Christ.

By which he shews, that he is uncertain which way to put the Objection, so as may be easiest to get rid of it : And therefore he has turn'd it several ways, and put several Questions about it. As First,

Why this Article of Faith, viz. That Jesus is the Messiah, is so often repeated in the New Testament.

His next Question is, *Why is this sometimes urged without the mentioning any other Article of Belief, which supposes that sometimes other Articles of Belief are mentioned with it.*

The Third Question is, *May we not infer from the frequent and sole repetition of this Article in several places of the Evangelists and Acts.*

Which last Question is in effect, *Why is this so frequently and alone repeated in the Evangelists and the Acts, i.e. in the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apostles to Unbelievers.*

vers. For of that he must give an account, if he will remove the difficulty. Which three, though put as one, yet are three as distinct Questions, and demand a Reason for three as distinct Matters of Fact, as these three are, viz. *frequently proposed; Sometimes propos'd alone; and always propos'd alone in the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apostles; for so in truth it was all through the Gospels and the Acts to the unconverted Believers of one God alone.*

These three Questions being thus jumbled together in one Objection, let us see how the Four particulars he mentions will account for them.

The first of them is this. *The believing of Jesus to be the promised Messiah, was, says he, the first step to Christianity.* Let it be so, what do you infer from thence? The next words shew, *Therefore this rather than any other Article was propounded to be believed by all those whom either our Saviour or his Apostles invited to embrace Christianity.* Let your Premises be never so true; and your Deduction of this Proposition be never so regular

Q from

from them, it is all lost Labour. This Conclusion is not the Proposition you were to prove. Your Questions were, *why this Article is so often proposed?* And in those frequent repetitions, *why sometimes urged alone, and why always proposed alone, viz. to those whom either our Saviour or his Apostles invited to embrace Christianity.* And your Answer is, because the believing *Jesus to be the Messias, was the first step to Christianity.* This therefore remains upon you to be proved,

XXXII.

That because the believing Jesus to be the Messias, is the first step to Christianity; therefore this Article is frequently proposed in the New Testament; Is sometimes proposed without the mentioning any other Article; and always alone to Unbelievers.

And when you have proved this, I shall desire you to apply it to our present Controversie.

His

His next Answer to those Questions is in these words, p. 76. *That though this one Proposition or Article be mentioned alone in some places, yet there is reason to think and be perswaded that at the same time other Matters of Faith were proposed.* From whence it lies upon him to make out this reasoning, viz.

XXXIII.

That because there is reason to think, and be perswaded, that at the same time, that this one Article was mentioned alone (as it was sometimes) other Matters of Faith were propos'd. Therefore this Article was often proposed in the New Testament; Sometimes proposed alone; and always proposed alone in the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apostles to Unbelievers.

This I set down to shew the force of his Answer to his Questions: Supposing it to be true, not that I grant it to be true, That where *this*

Q 2

one

one Article is mentioned alone, we have reason to think, and be perswaded, that at the same time other Matters of Faith [i. e. Articles of Faith necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian] were proposed: And I doubt not but to shew the contrary.

His Third particular, in Answer to the Question proposed in his Objection stands thus, p. 76. That though there are several Parts and Members of the Christian Faith, yet they do not all occur in any one place of the Scripture: which Answer lays it upon him to prove

XXXIV.

That because the several parts of the Members of the Christian Faith do not all occur in any one place of Scripture; Therefore this Article, That Jesus was the Messias, was often proposed in the New Testament, sometimes proposed alone, and always proposed alone in the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apostles, through the History of the Evangelists and the Acts.

The

The Fourth and last Particular, which he tells us is the main Answer to the Objection, is in these words, *Pag. 78.*

That Christianity was erected by degrees.

Which requires him to make out this Argument, *viz.*

XXXV.

That because Christianity was erected by degrees, Therefore this Article, that Jesus was the Messias, was often proposed in the New Testament, sometimes proposed alone, and always proposed alone in the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apostles to Unbelievers, recorded in the History of the Evangelists and Acts.

For, as I said before, in these three Questions he has put his Objection; To which he tells us this is the main Answer.

Of these four Particulars it is that he says, *p. 74. To clear this Objection, and to give a full and satisfactory Answer to all doubts in this Affair, I offer these ensuing particulars, which will lead the Reader to the right understanding of the whole case.*

How well they have *clear'd the Objection*, may be seen by barely setting them down as Answers to these Questions, wherein he puts the Objection.

This is all I have hitherto done: Whereby is very visible how well (supposing them true) they clear the Objection; and how pertinently they are brought to answer those Questions wherein his Objection is contain'd. Perhaps it will be said, that neither these, nor any thing else can be an apposite Answer to those Questions put so together. I answer, I am of the same mind. But if the *Unmasker* through ignorance or shuffling will talk thus confusedly, he must answer for it. He calls all his three Questions one Objection over and over again: And therefore which of those Questions it does or does not lie in, I shall not trouble my self to divine: Since I think

think he himself cannot tell. For, which ever he takes of them, it will involve him in equal Difficulties. I now proceed to examine his particulars themselves, and the truth contain'd in them. The first, *pag. 74.* stands thus.

1. *The believing of Jesus to be the promised Messias was the first step to Christianity. It was that which made way for the embracing of all the other Articles, a Passage to all the rest.*

Answ. If this be, as he would have it, only the leading Article amongst a great many other equally necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian; This is a reason, why it should be constantly preach'd in the first place. But this is no reason, why this alone should be so often repeated, and the other necessary Points not be once mention'd. For I desire to know, what those other Articles are, that in the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles are repeated or urged besides this?

In the next place, if it be true, that this Article, *viz.* That *Jesus* is the *Messiah*, was only the first in order, a-

mongst a great many Articles as necessary to be believed; how comes it to pass, that barely upon the Proposal and believing of this, Men were admitted into the Church as Believers? The History of the New Testament is full of instances of this, as *Act. VIII. 5. 12. 13. IX.* and in other places.

Though it be true what the *Unmasker* says here, *That if they did not give Credit to this in the first place, that Jesus of Nazareth was that Eminent and Extraordinary Person prophesied of long before, and that he was sent and Commissioned by God, there could be no hope that they would attend to any other Proposals relating to the Christian Religion; yet what he subjoins, That this is the true reason, why that Article was constantly propounded to be believed by all that looked towards Christianity, and why it is mention'd so often in the Evangelical Writing is not true.* For First, this supposes that there were other Articles joyn'd with it. This he should have first proved, and then given the reason of it; And not, as he does here, suppose what is in the Question, and then give a reason, why
it

it is so ; and such a reason that is inconsistent with the Matter of Fact, that is every where recorded in Holy Writ. For if the true reason, why the Preaching of this Article, that *Jesus* was the *Messiah*, as it is recorded in the History of the New Testament, were only to make way for the other Articles, one must needs think, that either our Saviour and his Apostles (with reverence be it spoken) were very strange Preachers ; Or that the Evangelists, and Author of the Acts were very strange Historians. The first were to instruct the World in a new Religion consisting of a great number of Articles, says the *Unmasker*, necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, *i. e.* a great number of Propositions making a large System, every one whereof is so necessary for a Man to understand, and believe, that if any one be omitted, he cannot be of that Religion. What now did our Saviour and his Apostles do ? Why, if the *Unmasker* may be believed, they went up and down with danger of their Lives, and Preach'd to the World. What did they Preach ? Even
this

this single Proposition to make way for the rest, *viz. This is the Eminent Man sent from God* to teach you other things, which amounts to no more but this, That *Jesus* was the Person which was to teach them the true Religion, but that true Religion it self is not to be found in all their Preaching; nay, scarce a word of it. Can there be any thing more ridiculous, than this? And yet this was all they Preach'd; if it be true, that this was all which they meant by the Preaching every where *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*; And if it were only an Introduction and a *making way* for the Doctrines of the Gospel. But it is plain it was called the Gospel it self. Let the *Unmasker*, as a true Successor of the Apostles, go and Preach the Gospel as the Apostles did; to some part of the Heathen World, where the Name of Christ is not known: Would not he himself, and every body think, he was very foolishly imploy'd, if he should tell them nothing but this, that *Jesus* was the Person promised and sent from God to reveal the true Religion; But should teach them nothing of that true Religion,

gion, but this Preliminary Article? Such the *Unmasker* makes all the Preaching recorded in the New Testament, for the Conversion of the Unbelieving World. He makes the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles, to be no more but this; that the great Prophet promised to the World was come, and that *Jesus* was he: But what his Doctrine was, that they were silent in, and taught not one Article of it. But the *Unmasker* mis-represents it: For as to his accusing the Historians, the Evangelists, and Writers of the Acts of the Apostles, for their shameful omission of the whole Doctrine of the Christian Religion, to save his Hypothesis, as he does under his next Head in these words, *That though this one Proposition be mention'd alone in some places, yet there is reason to think and be perswaded, that at the same time other Matters of Faith were proposed*; I shall shew how bold he makes with those inspired Historians, when I come to consider that particular.

How ridiculous, how senseless this bold *Unmasker* and Reformer of the History

History of the New Testament makes the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles, as it stands recorded of them by infallible Writers, is visible. But taking it as in truth it is there, we shall have a quite other view of it. Our Saviour Preach'd every where the Kingdom of God, and by his Miracles declar'd himself to be the King of that Kingdom. The Apostles Preached the same, and after his Ascension openly avowed him to be the Prince and Saviour promis'd. But Preach'd not this, as a bare Speculative Article of simple belief. But that Men might receive him for their King, and become his Subjects. When they told the World that he was the Christ, it was not as the *Unmasker* will have it; Believe this Man to be a Prophet, and then he will teach you his new Religion; which when you have received and imbraced, all and every Article thereof, which are a great number, you will then be Christians, if you be not ignorant or incredulous of any of them. But it was, Believe this Man to be your King sent from God: Take him for such, with a resolution to observe

serve the Laws he has given you, and you are his Subjects, you are Christians. For those, that truly did so, made themselves his Subjects : And to continue so there was no more required than a sincere endeavour to know his Will in all things, and to obey it. Such a Preaching as this of *Jesus* to be the *Messiah* ; the King and Deliverer that God Almighty had promised to Mankind, and now had effectually sent to be their Prince and Ruler ; was not a simple preparation to the Gospel : But when received with the Obedience of Faith, was the very receiving of the Gospel ; and had all that was requisite to make Men Christians. And without it be so understood, no body can clear the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles from that incredible Imperfection ; or their Historians from that unpardonable negligence, and not doing either what they ought, or what they undertook ; which our *Unmasker* hath so impiously charged upon them, as will appear yet plainer in what I have to say to the *Unmasker's* next Particular. For as to the remainder
of

of this Paragraph, it contains nothing but his censure and contempt of me, for not being of his Mind ; for not seeing as he sees, *i. e.* in effect not laying that blame, which he does either on the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles ; or on the inspired Writings of their Historians, to make them comply with his System, and the Christianity he would make.

The *Unmasker's* Second Particular, p. 76. tells us, *That though this One Proposition or Article be mention'd alone in some places, yet there is reason to think, and be perswaded, that at the same time other Matters of Faith were propos'd. For it is confess'd by all intelligent and observing Men, that the History of the Scripture is concise ; and that in relating of Matter of Fact many Passages are omitted by the Sacred Penmen. Wherefore though but this one Article of belief, (because it is a Leading one, and makes way for the rest) be expressly mention'd in some of the Gospels, yet we must not conclude thence, that no other Matter of Faith, was requir'd to be admitted of. For things are briefly set down in the Evangelical Records,*

Records, and we must suppose many things which are not in direct terms related.

Answ. The *Unmasker* here keeps to his usual custom of speaking in doubtful terms. He says, that where this one Article, that *Jesus* is the *Messiah*, is alone recorded in the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles, *We have reason to be perswaded, that at the same time other Matters of Faith were propos'd.* If this be to his purpose, by *Matters of Faith* must be meant Fundamental Articles of Faith, absolutely necessary to be believed by every Man to make him a Christian. That such *Matters of Faith* are omitted in the History of the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles by the Sacred Historians, this, he says, *we have reason to be perswaded of.*

Answ. They need be good Reasons to perswade a rational Man, that the Evangelists in their History of our Saviour and his Apostles (if they were but ordinarily fair and prudent Men) did, in an History publish'd to instruct the World in a new Religion, leave out the necessary and Fundamental parts

parts of that Religion. But let them be consider'd as inspired Writers, under the Conduct of the infallible Spirit of God, putting them upon, and directing them in the writing of this History of the Gospel, and then it is impossible for any Christian, but the *Unmasker*, to think, that they made any such gross Omissions, contrary to the design of their Writing, without a Demonstration to convince him of it. Now all the reason that our *Unmasker* gives is this: *That it is confessed by all intelligent and observing Men, that the History of the Scripture is concise, and that in relating Matters of Fact, many Passages are omitted by the Sacred Penmen.*

Answ. The *Unmasker* might have spar'd the Confession of *intelligent and observing Men*, after so plain a Declaration of St. John himself, Chap. XX. 31. *Many other things did Jesus in the presence of his Disciples, which are not written in this Book.* And again, XXI. 25. *There are also many other things that Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose the world could not contain the Books that should be*

be written. There needs therefore no opinion of *intelligent and observing Men* to convince us, that the History of the Gospel is so far *Concise*, that a great many *Matters of Fact* are omitted, and a great many less material Circumstances, even of those that are set down. But will any *intelligent or observing Man*, any one that bears the Name of a Christian, have the Impudence to say, that the inspired Writers, in the relation they give us of what Christ and his Apostles Preach'd to Unbelievers to convert them to the Faith, omitted the Fundamental Articles which those Preachers proposed to make Men Christians; and without a belief of which they could not be Christians?

The *Unmasker* talks after his wonted fashion; seems to say something, which when examin'd proves nothing to his Purpose. He tells us, *That in some places* where the Article of Jesus the Messiah is *mention'd alone*, at the same time other matters of Faith were proposed. I ask, were these other matters of Faith all the *Unmasker's* necessary Articles? If not, what are

R

those

those other matters of Faith to the *Unmasker's* Purpose? As for Example, in *St. Peter's Sermon*, *Act. II.* Other matters of Faith were proposed with the Article of *Jesus the Messiah*. But what does this make for His Fundamental Articles? Were They all propos'd with the Articles of *Jesus the Messiah*? If not, Unbelievers were converted and brought into the Church without the *Unmasker's* necessary Articles. Three Thousand were added to the Church by this one Sermon. I pass by now *St. Luke's* not mentioning a Syllable of the greatest part of the *Unmasker's* necessary Articles; and shall consider only, how long that Sermon may have been. 'Tis plain from *v. 15.* that it began not till about Nine in the Morning, and from *v. 41.* that before Night Three Thousand were converted and Baptized. Now, I ask the *Unmasker*, whether so small a Number of Hours as *St. Peter* must necessarily imploy in Preaching to them were sufficient to instruct such a mixed Multitude so fully in all those Articles, which he has propos'd as necessary to be believed to make a
Man

Man a Christian, as that every one of those Three Thousand, that were that day Baptized, did understand and explicitly believe every one of those his Articles, just in the sense of our *Unmasker's* System? Not to mention those remaining Articles which the *Unmasker* will not be able in twice as many Months to find and declare to us.

He says, *That in some places where the Article of Jesus the Messiah is mentioned alone, at the same time other matters of Faith were proposed.* Let us take this for so at present, yet this helps not the *Unmasker's* case. The Fundamental Articles, that were propos'd by our Saviour and his Apostles, necessary to be believed to make Men Christians, are not set down; *but only this single one of Jesus the Messiah:* Therefore will any one dare to say that they are omitted every where by the Evangelists? Did the Historians of the Gospel make their relation so *concise* and short, that giving an account in so many places of the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles for the Conversion of the Unbelieving World,

R 2 they

they did not in any one place, nor in in all of them together, set down the necessary Points of that Faith, which their Unbelieving Hearers were converted to? If they did not, how can their Histories be called the Gospels of *Jesus Christ*? Or how can they serve to the end for which they were written? Which was, to publish to the World the Doctrine of *Jesus Christ*, that Men might be brought into his Religion? Now I challenge the *Unmasker* to shew me not out of any one place, but out of all the preachings of our Saviour and his Apostles, recorded in the four Gospels, and the Acts, all those Propositions which he has reckon'd up as Fundamental Articles of Faith. If they are not to be found there, 'tis plain, that either they are not Articles of Faith necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian; or else, that those inspired Writers have given us an account of the Gospel, or Christian Religion, wherein the greatest part of Doctrines necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian are wholly omitted: Which in short is to say, that the Christianity
which

which is recorded in the Gospels and the Acts, is not that Christianity, which is sufficient to make a Man a Christian. This (as absurd and impious as it is) is what our *Unmasker* charges upon the *Conciseness*, (as he is pleased to call it) of the Evangelical History. And this we must take upon his word; Though these inspired Writers tell us the direct contrary. For St. *Luke* in his Preface to his Gospel, tells *Theophilus*, that having a perfect knowledge OF ALL THINGS, the Design of his Writing was to set them in order, that he might know the certainty of those things, that were believed amongst Christians. And his History of the Acts begins thus, *The former Treatise* [i. e. his Gospel] *have I made*, O *Theophilus*, *of ALL that Jesus began to do and to teach*. So that how concise soever the *Unmasker* will have his History to be, he professes it to contain ALL that Jesus taught. Which ALL must, in the narrowest sense, that can be given it, contain at least *all* things necessary to make a Man a Christian. 'Twould else be a very lame and im-

perfect History of *ALL* that Jesus taught; if the Faith contained in it were not sufficient to make a Man a Christian. This indeed, as the *Unmasker* hath been pleased to term it, would be a very *lank Faith*, a very *lank Gospel*.

St. *John* also says thus of his History of the Gospel, Ch. XX. 30, 31. *Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his Disciples, which are not written in this Book: So far his History is by his own Confession concise. But these, says he, are written, that ye might believe, that Jesus is the Messiah the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his Name.* As concise as it was, there was yet (if the Apostle's word may be taken for it against the *Unmasker's*) enough contained in his Gospel, for the procuring of eternal life to those who believed it. And whether it was that one Article that he there sets down, viz. That *Jesus was the Messiah*, or that Set of Articles which the *Unmasker* gives us, I shall leave to this Modern Divine to resolve. And if he thinks still, that all the Articles he has set down in his Roll,

Roll, are necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, I must desire him to shew them to me in St. *John's* Gospel, or else to convince the World, that St. *John* was mistaken, when he said, that he had written his Gospel, that Men might believe that *Jesus is the Messiah the Son of God, and that believing they might have life through his Name.*

So that granting the *History of the Scripture* to be so *concise* as the *Unmasker* would have it, viz. That in *some places* the infallible Writers, recording the Discourses of our Saviour and his Apostles, omitted all the other Fundamental Articles propos'd by them to be believed to make Men Christians, but this one, that *Jesus* was the *Messiah*; Yet this will not remove the Objection that lies against his other Fundamentals, which are not to be found in the Histories of the Four Evangelists; nay, which are not to be found in every one of them. If every one of them contains the Gospel of *Jesus Christ*, and consequently all things necessary to Salvation, Whether this will not be a new ground of

Accusation against me, and give the *Unmasker* a right to charge me with laying by three of the Gospels with *contempt*, as well as he did before charge me with a *contempt* of the Epistles, must be left to his sovereign Authority to determine.

Having shew'd, that allowing all he says here to be as he would have it, yet it clears not the Objection, that lies against his Fundamentals; I shall now examine what truth there is, in what he here pretends, *viz.* that though the one Article, that Jesus is the Messiah, be mention'd *alone in some places*, yet we have reason to be perswaded from the *conciseness* of the Scripture History, that there were at the same time join'd with it other necessary Articles of Faith in the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles.

It is to be observed, that the *Unmasker* builds upon this false Supposition, that in *some places* other necessary Articles of Faith join'd with that of *Jesus the Messiah*, are by the Evangelists mention'd to be propos'd by our Saviour and his Apostles, as necessary to be believed to make those they

they Preach'd to Christians. For his saying, that in some places that *one necessary Article is mention'd alone*, implies that in other places it is not mention'd alone, but join'd with other necessary Articles. And then it will remain upon him to shew,

XXXVI.

In what place either of the Gospels or of the Acts, other Articles of Faith are join'd with this, and propos'd as necessary to be believed to make Men Christians.

The *Unmasker*, 'tis probable, will tell us, that the Article of Christ's Resurrection is sometimes join'd with this of the *Messiah*, as particularly in that first Sermon of *St. Peter*, Acts II. by which there were Three Thousand added to the Church at one time. *Answ.* This Sermon well consider'd, will explain to us both the Preaching of the Apostles, what it was that they propos'd to their unbelieving Auditors to make them Christians; and also the manner of *St. Luke's* recording their Sermons.

Sermons. 'Tis true, that here are deliver'd by *St. Peter* many other *Matters of Faith* besides that of *Jesus* being the *Messiah* : For all that he said being of Divine Authority, is *Matter of Faith*, and may not be disbelieved. The first Part of his Discourse, is to prove to the *Jews*, that what they had observed of Extraordinary at that time amongst the Disciples, who spake variety of Tongues, did not proceed from Wine, but from the Holy Ghost; And that this was the pouring out of the Spirit prophesied of by the Prophet *Joel*. This is all *Matter of Faith*, and is written, that it might be believed : But yet, I think, that neither the *Unmasker*, nor any body else will say, that this is such a necessary Article of Faith, that no Man could without an explicit belief of it, be a Christian : Though being a Declaration of the Holy Ghost by *St. Peter*, it is so much a *Matter of Faith*, that nobody, to whom it is now propos'd, can deny it and be a Christian. And thus all the Scripture of the New Testament, given by Divine Inspiration is *Matter of Faith*, and necessary to be believed by

by all Christians to whom it is propos'd. But yet I do not think any one so unreasonable as to say, that every Proposition in the New Testament is a Fundamental Article of Faith, which is required explicitly to be believed to make a Man a Christian.

Here now is a *matter of Faith* join'd, in the same Sermon, with this Fundamental Article that *Jesus is the Messiah*; And reported by the Sacred Historian so at large, that it takes up a Third part of St. Peter's Sermon recorded by St. Luke; And yet it is such a *matter of Faith*, as is not contain'd in the *Unmasker's* Catalogue of necessary Articles. I must ask him then, whether St. Luke were so *concise* an Historian, that he would so at large set down a *matter of Faith* propos'd by St. Peter, that was not necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, and wholly leave out the very mention of all the *Unmasker's* additional necessary Articles, it indeed they were necessary to be believed to make Men Christians? I know not how any one could charge the Historian with greater unfaithfulness,

ness, or greater folly. But this the *Unmasker* sticks not at, to preserve to himself the Power of appointing, what shall, and what shall not be *necessary* Articles; and of making his System the Christianity necessary, and only necessary to be received.

The next thing that *St. Peter* proceeds to in this his Sermon is, to declare to the Unbelieving *Jews*, that *Jesus of Nazareth*, who had done Miracles amongst them, whom they had Crucified and put to Death, and whom God had raised again from the Dead, was the *Messiah*.

Here indeed our Saviour's Crucifixion, Death, and Resurrection are mentioned: And if they were nowhere else recorded, are *matters of Faith*; which, with all the rest of the New Testament, ought to be believed by every Christian to whom it is thus propos'd; as a part of Divine Revelation. But that these were not here propos'd to the Unbelieving *Jews*, as the Fundamental Articles, which *St. Peter* principally aimed at, and endeavoured to convince them of, is evident from hence; That they are
made

made use of as Arguments to perswade them of this Fundamental Truth, *viz.* That *Jesus* was the *Messiah*, whom they ought to take for their Lord and Ruler. For whatsoever is brought as an Argument to prove another Truth, cannot be thought to be the principal thing aimed at in that argumentation; though it may have so strong and immediate a connexion with the Conclusion, that you cannot deny it without denying even what is inferr'd from it, and is therefore the fitter to be an Argument to prove it. But that our Saviour's Crucifixion, Death, and Resurrection, were used here as Arguments to perswade them into a belief of this Fundamental Article, that *Jesus* was the *Messiah*; and not as Propositions of a new Faith they were to receive; is evident from hence, that they Preach'd here to those who knew the Death and Crucifixion of *Jesus*, as well as *Peter*: And therefore these could not be propos'd to them as new Articles of Faith to be believed: But those Matters of Fact, being what the *Jews* knew already, were a good Argument joyn'd with
his

his Resurrection to convince them of that truth, which he endeavoured to give them a Belief of. And therefore he rightly inferred from these Facts joined together, this Conclusion, the believing whereof would make them Christians. *Therefore let all the House of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, Lord and Christ.* To the making good this sole Proposition his whole Discourse tended: This was the sole Truth he laboured to convince them of: This the Faith he endeavoured to bring them into; which as soon as they had received with Repentance, they were by Baptism admitted into the Church, and three Thousand at once made Christians.

Here St. *Luke's* own Confession, without that *of intelligent and observing men*, which the *Unmasker* has recourse to, might have satisfied him again, *that in relating matters of Fact, many passages are omitted by the sacred Pen-men.* For says St. *Luke* here v. 40. *And with many other words, which are not set down.*

One would at first sight, wonder why the *Unmasker* neglects these demonstrative Authorities of the Holy Pen-men themselves, where they own their Omissions, to tell us, that it is *confessed by all intelligent and observing men, that in relating matters of Fact, many Passages are omitted by the sacred Pen-men.* St. John in what he says of his Gospel, directly professes large Omissions, and so does St. Luke here. But these Omissions would not serve the *Unmasker's* turn: For they are directly against him, and what he would have: And therefore he had reason to pass them by. For St. John, in that passage above-cited, Ch. XX. 30, 31. tells us, that how much soever he had left out of his History, he had incerted that, which was enough to be believed to eternal Life. *But these are written that ye might believe, and believing ye might have life.* But this is not all he assures us of, viz. That he had recorded all that was necessary to be believed to eternal Life: But he in express words, tells us what is that *ALL* that is necessary to be believed to eternal Life; and for the Proof of which

which Proposition alone, he writ all the rest of his Gospel, *viz.* That we might believe. What? Even this. *That Jesus is the Christ the Son of God,* and that *believing* this we might have *life through his Name.*

This may serve for a Key to us, in reading the History of the New Testament; And shew us, why this Article that *Jesus* was the *Messiah*, is nowhere omitted, though a great part of the Arguments used to convince Men of it, nay very often the whole Discourse made to lead Men into the Belief of it, be entirely omitted. The Spirit of God directed them every where to set down the Article, which was absolutely necessary to be believed to make Men Christians; So that That could no ways be doubted of nor mistaken; But the Arguments, and Evidences, which were to lead Men into this Faith, would be sufficient, if they were once found any where, though scattered here and there in those Writings, whereof that infallible Spirit was the Author. This preserved the Decorum used in all Histories, and avoided those continual large
and

and unnecessary Repetitions, which our critical *Unmasker* might have call'd *tedious*, with juster Reason, than he does the Repetition of this short Proposition, that *Jesus* is the *Messiah*; which I set down no oftner in my Book, than the Holy Ghost thought fit to insert in the History of the New Testament, as concise as it is. But this it seems to our Nice *Unmasker*, is *tedious*, tedious and offensive. And if a Christian and a Successor of the Apostles cannot bear the being so often told, what it was, that our Saviour and his Apostles every where preach'd to the Believers of one God, though it be contain'd in one short Proposition; What cause of Exception, and disgust would it have been to Heathen Readers, some whereof might perhaps have been as Critical as the *Unmasker*, if this sacred History had in every Page been filled with the repeated Discourses of the Apostles, all of them every where to the same purpose, viz. to perswade Men to believe, that *Jesus* was the *Messiah*? It was necessary even by the Laws of History, as often as their preaching any where

was mention'd to tell to what purpose they spoke; which being always to convince Men of this one Fundamental Truth, 'tis no wonder, we find it so often repeated. But the Arguments and Reasonings, with which this one Point is urged, are, as they ought to be, in most places left out. A constant Repetition of them had been superfluous, and consequently might justly have been blam'd as *tedious*. But there is enough recorded abundantly to convince any rational Man, any one not willfully blind, that he is that promised Saviour. And in this we have a reason of the Omissions in the History of the New Testament; which were no other than such, as became prudent, as well as faithful Writers. Much less did that Conciseness (with which the *Unmasker* would cover his bold Censure of the Gospels and the Acts, and as it seems, lay them by with *Contempt*) make the holy Writers omit any thing, in the preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles, absolutely necessary to be known, and believed to make Men Christians.

Confor-

Conformable hereunto, we shall find St. *Luke* writes his History of the Acts of the Apostles. In the beginning of it he sets down at large some of the Discourses made to the unbelieving *Jews*. But in most other Places, unless it be where there was something particular in the Circumstances of the Matter, he contents himself to tell to what purpose they spoke: Which was every where only this, That *Jesus* was the *Messiah*. Nay, St. *Luke* in the first Speech of St. *Peter*, Act. 11. which he thought fit to give us a great part of, yet owns the Omission of several things, that the Apostle said. For having expressed this Fundamental Doctrine, That *Jesus* was the *Messiah*, and recorded several of the Arguments wherewith St. *Peter* urged it for the Conversion of the unbelieving *Jews* his Auditors, he adds v. 40. *And with many other words did he testify and exhort saying, Save your selves from this untoward Generation.* Here he confesses, that he omitted a great deal which St. *Peter* had said to persuade them. To what? To that which

in other words he had just said before v. 38. *Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, i. e. Believe Jesus to be the Messiah, take him as such for your Lord and King, and reform your Lives by a sincere Resolution of Obedience to his Laws.*

Thus we have an account of the Omissions in the Records of *Matters of Fact* in the New Testament. But will the *Unmasker* say, that the preaching of those Articles, that he has given us as necessary to be believ'd to make a Man a Christian, was part of *those Matters of Fact*, which have been omitted in the History of the New Testament? Can any one think that *the Corruption and Degeneracy of humane Nature, with the true Original of it (the Defection of our first Parents) the Propagation of Sin and Mortality, our Restoration and Reconciliation by Christ's blood, the Eminency and Excellency of his Priesthood, the Efficacy of his Death, the full Satisfaction thereby made to divine Justice, and his being made an all-sufficient Sacrifice for Sin, our Justification by*
Christ,

Christ's Righteousness, Election, Adoption, &c. were all proposed, and that too in the Sense of our Authors System, by our Saviour and his Apostles, as Fundamental Articles of Faith, necessary to be explicitly believed by every Man, to make him a Christian, in all their Discourses to Unbelievers; And yet that the inspired Pen-men of those Histories every where, left the mention of these Fundamental Articles wholly out? This would have been to have writ not a *concise*, but an imperfect History of all, that *Jesus* and his Apostles taught.

What an account would it have been of the Gospel, as it was first preached and propagated, if the greatest part of the necessary Doctrines of it were wholly left out, and a Man could not find from one end to the other of this whole History, that Religion, which is necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian? And yet this is that, which under the Notion of their being *concise*, the *Unmasker* would persuade us to have been done by St. *Luke* and the other Evangelists in their Histories. And

'tis no less than what he plainly says in his *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*, p. 109. Where to aggravate my Fault in passing by the Epistles, and to shew the Necessity of search in them for Fundamentals, he in words blames me; But in effect, condemns the Sacred History contain'd in the Gospels and the Acts. *It is most evident*, says he, *to any thinking Man*, that the Author of the Reasonableness of Christianity *purposely omits the Epistolary Writings of the Apostles, because they are fraught with other Fundamental Doctrines besides that one which he mentions. There we are instructed concerning these grand heads of Christian Divinity. Here i. e. in the Epistles, says he, There are Discoveries concerning Satisfaction, &c. and in the close of his List of his Grand Heads, as he calls them, some whereof I have above set down out of him, he adds, These are the Matters of Faith contained in the Epistles.* By all which Expressions he plainly signifies, that these, which he calls *Fundamental Doctrines*, are none of those, we are instructed in, in the Gospels and the Acts; that they are not *discover'd*
nor

nor contain'd in the historical Writings of the Evangelists. Whereby he confesses, that either our Saviour and his Apostles did not propose them in their Preachings to their unbelieving Hearers; or else, that the several faithful Writers of their History, willfully, *i. e.* unfaithfully, every where omitted them in the account they have left us of those Preachings; Which could scarce possibly be done by them all, and every where, without an actual Combination amongst them to smother the greatest and most material parts of our Saviour's and his Apostles Discourses. For what else did they, if all that the *Unmasker* has set down in his List be Fundamental Doctrines; every one of them absolutely necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian; which our Saviour and his Apostles every where preached to make Men Christians; but yet *St. Luke* and the other *Evangelists*, by a very guilty, and unpardonable *Conciseness*, every where omitted them; and throughout their whole History never once tell us, they were so much as proposed; much less that they

were those Articles, which the Apostles laboured to establish and convince Men of every where, before they admitted them to Baptism? Nay, the far greatest part of them the History, they writ, does not any where so much as once mention? How after such an Imputation as this the *Unmasker* will clear himself from laying by the four Gospels and the Acts *with contempt* let him look; if my not collecting Fundamentals out of the Epistles had that Guilt in it. For I never denied all the Fundamental Doctrines to be there; but only said, that there they were not easie to be found out; and distinguished from Doctrines not Fundamental. Whereas our good *Unmasker* charges the historical Books of the New Testament with a total Omission of the far greatest part of those Fundamental Doctrines of Christianity, which he says are absolutely necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian.

To convince the Reader what was absolutely required to be believed to make a Man a Christian, and thereby
clear

clear the holy Writers from the *Unmasker's* Slander, any one need but look a little further into the History of the Acts, and observe St. *Luke's* Method in the Writing of it. In the beginning (as we observed before) and in some few other places, he sets down at large the Discourses made by the Preachers of Christianity to their unbelieving Auditors. But in the Process of his History, he generally contents himself to relate, what it was their Discourses drive at; what was the Doctrine they endeavour'd to convince their unbelieving Hearers of, to make them Believers. This we may observe is never omitted. This is every where set down. Thus *Acts V. 42.* he tells us, that *daily in the Temple, and in every house the Apostles ceased not to teach, and to preach JESUS THE MESSIAH.* The particulars of their Discourses he omits, and the Arguments they used to induce Men to believe he omits: But never fails to inform us carefully what it was the Apostles *taught and preach'd*, and would have Men believe. The account he gives us of St. *Paul's* Preaching at *Thessa-*

Thessalonica, is this : That *three Sabbath Days* he REASON'D with the Jews out of the Scriptures, OPENING and ALLEDGING that the Messiah must needs have Suffer'd and risen again from the Dead ; and that Jesus was the Messiah, Act. XVII. 2, 3. At Corinth, That he REASON'D in the Synagogue every Sabbath, and PERSWADED the Jews and the Greeks, and TESTIFIED that Jesus was the Messiah. XVIII. 4, 5. That Apollos mightily convinced the Jews, SHEWING BY THE SCRIPTURES that Jesus was the Messiah, XVIII. 27.

By these, and the like places, we may be satisfied what it was that the Apostles Taught and Preach'd, even this one Proposition that Jesus was the Messiah ; For this was the sole Proposition they reason'd about ; this alone they testified, and they shew'd out of the Scriptures ; and of this alone they endeavour'd to convince the Jews and the Greeks, that believed one God. So that it is plain from hence, that St. Luke omitted nothing, that the Apostles Taught and Preach'd ; none of those Doctrines, that it was necessary

fary to *convince* Unbelievers of, to make them Christians: Though he in most places omitted, as was fit, the Passages of Scripture which they alledg'd, and the Arguments those inspired Preachers used to *perswade* Men to believe and imbrace that Doctrine.

Another convincing Argument, to shew that St. *Luke* omitted none of those Fundamental Doctrines which the Apostles any where propos'd as necessary to be believed, is from that different account he gives us of their Preaching in other places, and to Auditors otherwise dispos'd. Where the Apostles had to do with Idolatrous Heathens, who were not yet come to the knowledge of the only true God, there he tells us they propos'd also the Article of the one Invisible God, Maker of Heaven and Earth: And this we find recorded in him out of their Preaching to the *Lystrians*, Act. XIV. and to the *Athenians*, Act. XVII. in the later of which St. *Luke*, to convince his Reader that he out of *conciseness* omits none of those Fundamental Articles,
that

that were any where propos'd by the Preachers of the Gospel as necessary to be believed to make Men Christians, sets down not only the Article of *Jesus the Messiah*, but that also of the one invisible God, Creator of all things, which (if any necessary one might) this of all other Fundamental Articles might by an Author, that affected brevity, with the fairest excuse have been omitted, as being implied in that other of the *Messiah ordained* by God. Indeed, in the Story of what *Paul* and *Barnabas* said at *Lystra*, the Article of the *Messiah* is not mention'd. Not that *St. Luke* omitted that Fundamental Article, where the Apostles taught it: But they having here begun their Preaching with that of the one living God, they had not, as appears, time to proceed farther, and propose to them what yet remain'd to make them Christians: But they were, by the instigation of the *Jews*, fallen upon, and *Paul* stoned, before he could come to open to them this other Fundamental Article of the Gospel.

This by the way shews the *Unmasker's* Mistake in his first Particular,

lar, p. 74. where he says (as he does here again in his second Particular, which we are now examining) that *believing Jesus to be the Messiah is the first step to Christianity; and therefore this, rather than any other, was propounded to be believed by all those, whom either our Saviour, or the Apostles, invited to embrace Christianity.* The contrary whereof appears here; Where the Article of one God is proposed in the first place, to those whose Unbelief made such a proposal necessary. And therefore if his Reason (which he uses again here, p. 76.) were good, viz. That the Article of the *Messiah* is expressly mention'd alone, *because it is a leading Article and makes way for the rest*, this Reason would rather conclude for the Article of *one God*: And that alone should be expressly mentioned instead of the other. Since as he argues for the other, p. 74. *if they did not believe this in the first place, viz. That there was one God, there could be no hopes that they would attend unto any other Proposal relating to the Christian Religion.* The Vanity and Falshood of which reasoning, viz. That

That the Article of Jesus the Messiah was every where *propounded rather than any other, because it was the leading Article*, we see in the History of St. Paul's Preaching to the *Athenians*. St. Luke mentions more than one Article, where more than one was propos'd by St. Paul; though the first of them was that *leading Article* of one God, which if not received *in the first place, there could be no hope they would attend to the rest.*

Something the *Unmasker* would make of this Argument of a *leading Article* for want of a better, though he knows not what. In his first *particular*, p. 74. he makes use of it to shew, why there was but that one Article propos'd by the first Preachers of the Gospel, and how well that succeeds with him we have seen. For this is Demonstration, that if there were but that one propos'd by our Saviour and the Apostles, there was but that one necessary to be believed to make Men Christians: Unless he will impiously say that our Saviour and the Apostles went about Preaching to no purpose. For if they propos'd
not

not all that was necessary to make Men Christians, 'twas in vain for them to Preach, and others to Hear; if when they heard and believ'd all that was propos'd to them, they were not yet Christians: For if any Article was omitted in the Proposal, which was necessary to make a Man a Christian, though they believed all that was proposed to them, they could not yet be Christians; unless a Man can from an Infidel become a Christian, without doing what is necessary to make him a Christian.

Further, if his Argument of its being a *leading Article* proves, that that alone was propos'd, It is a Contradiction to give it as a Reason, why it was *set down alone*, by the Historian where it was not proposed alone by the Preacher, but other necessary *matters of Faith were propos'd with it*; unless it can be true that this Article of *Jesus is the Messiah*, was propos'd alone by our Saviour and his Apostles, because it was a *leading Article*, and was mention'd alone in the History of what they preach'd, because it was a *leading Article*, though it were not propos'd

propos'd alone, but jointly with other necessary *matters of Faith*. For this is the use he makes here again, *p. 76.* of his *leading Article* under his second *Particular*, viz. To shew why the Historians mention'd this necessary Article, of *Jesus the Messiah*, alone, in places where the Preachers of the Gospel propos'd it not alone, but with other necessary Articles. But in this latter case it has no shew of a Reason at all. It may be granted as reasonable for the Teachers of any Religion not to go any farther, where they see the first Article which they propose is rejected, where the *leading Truth*, on which all the rest depends, is not received. But it can be no reason at all for an Historian who writes the History of these first Preachers, to set down only the one first and leading Article and omit all the rest, in instances where more were not only propos'd, but believed and imbraced, and upon that the Hearers and Believers admitted into the Church. 'Tis not for Historians to put any distinction between leading or not leading Articles ; But if they will give a true
and

and useful account of the Religion, whose Original they are writing, and of the Converts made to it, they must tell, not one, but all those necessary Articles, upon assent to which Converts were Baptized into that Religion, and admitted into the Church. Whoever says otherwise, accuses them of falsifying the Story, misleading the Readers, and giving a wrong account of the Religion which they pretend to teach the World, and to preserve and propagate to future Ages. This (if it were so) no pretence of *conciseness* could excuse or palliate.

There is yet remaining one Consideration, which were sufficient of it self to convince us, that it was the sole Article of Faith which was preach'd; And that if there had been other Articles necessary to be known and believed by Converts, they could not upon any pretence of *conciseness* be supposed to be omitted: And that is the Commissions of those, that were sent to Preach the Gospel. Which since the Sacred Historians mention, they cannot be suppos'd to leave out
T any

any of the material and main Heads of those Commissions.

St. *Luke* records it, Ch. IV. 43. that our Saviour says of himself, *I must go unto the other Towns to tell the good news of the Kingdom, for (εἰς τὰς πόλεις) upon this Errand am I SENT.* This St. *Mark* calls simply *Preaching.* This Preaching what it contain'd St. *Matthew* tells us, Ch. IV. 23. *And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their Synagogues, and preaching the good news of the Kingdom, and healing all manner of Sickness, and all manner of Diseases amongst the People.* Here we have his Commission, or End of his being sent, and the Execution of it : Both terminating in this, that he declar'd the good News that the Kingdom of the *Messiah* was come ; and gave them to understand by the Miracles he did, that he himself was he. Nor does St. *Matthew* seem to affect such *conciseness*, that he would have left it out, if the Gospel had contained any other Fundamental Parts, necessary to be believed to make Men Christians. For he here says, *all manner of Sickness, and all manner of Disease*, when either of them

them might have been better left out, than any necessary Article of the Gospel to make his History *concise*.

We see what our Saviour was *sent* for. In the next place, let us look into the Commission he gave the Apostles, when he *sent* them to Preach the Gospel. We have it in the X. of St. *Matthew*, in these words ; Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any City of the Samaritans enter ye not. But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as ye go PREACH, SAYING THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS AT HAND. Heal the Sick, cleanse the Lepers, raise the Dead, cast out Devils : Freely have ye received freely give. Provide neither Gold, nor Silver, nor Brass in your Purses ; nor Scrip in your journey ; neither two Coats, neither Shooes nor yet Staves (for the Workman is worthy of his meat). And into whatsoever City or Town ye shall enter, enquire who in it is worthy, and there abide till ye go thence. And when ye come into any house salute it. And if the house be worthy, let your peace come upon it : But if it be not worthy, let your peace return to you. And who-

A Second Vindication of the

soever shall not receive you, nor hear your words ; When ye depart out of that house or City, shake off the dust of your feet. Verily, I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for the Land of Sodom and Gomorrha, in the day of judgment, than for that City. Behold, I send you forth as Sheep in the midst of Wolves : Be ye therefore wise as Serpents, and harmless as Doves. But beware of Men , for they will deliver you up to the Councils, and they will scourge you in their Synagogues. And ye shall be brought before Governours, and Kings for my sake, for a Testimony against them and the Gentiles. But when they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak ; for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you. And the Brother shall deliver up the Brother to Death, and the Father the Child : and the Children shall rise up against the Parents, and cause them to be put to Death. And ye shall be hated of all men for my Name's sake : But he that endureth to the end shall be saved. But when they

they persecute you in this City, flee ye into another: For verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over the Cities of Israel till the Son of man be come. The Disciple is not above his Master, nor the Servant above his Lord. It is enough for the Disciple that he be as his Master, and the Servant as his Lord. If they have called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household? Fear them not therefore: For there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known. What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light: And what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the house tops. And fear not them which kill the Body, but are not able to kill the Soul: But rather fear him which is able to destroy both Soul and body in Hell. Are not two Sparrows sold for a farthing; And one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father? But the very hairs of your head are all numbred. Fear ye not therefore, ye are of more value than many Sparrows. Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I

A Second Vindication of the

confess also before my Father which is in Heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in Heaven. Think not that I am come to send peace on Earth; I came not to send peace but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his Father, and the Daughter against her Mother, and the Daughter-in Law against the Mother in Law. And a man's foes shall be they of his own household. He that loveth Father and Mother more than me, is not worthy of me: And he that loveth Son or Daughter more than me, is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not his Cross and followeth after me, is not worthy of me. He that findeth his life shall lose it: And he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it. He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me. He that receiveth a Prophet in the name of a Prophet, shall receive a Prophets reward; and he that receiveth a righteous man, shall receive a righteous mans reward. And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only, in the name of a Disciple,

Disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward. And it came to pass when Jesus had made an end of Commanding his twelve Disciples.

This is the Commission our Saviour gave the Apostles when he sent them abroad to recover, and save *the lost Sheep of the house of Israel*. And will any of the *Unmasker's* intelligent and observing Men say, that the *History of the Scripture* is so concise, that any passages, any essential, any material, nay any parts at all of the Apostles Commission are here omitted by the *Sacred Penman*? This Commission is set down so at full, and so particularly, that *S. Matthew*, who was one of them to whom it was given, seems not to have left out one word of all, that our Saviour gave them in charge. And it is so large, even to every particular Article of their Instructions, that I doubt not but my citing so much, *verbatim* out of the Sacred Text, will here again be troublesome to the *Unmasker*. But whether he will venture again to call it *tedious*, must be as Nature or Caution happen to have the better on't. Can any one who reads

this Commission, unless he hath the Brains as well as the Brow of an *Unmasker*, alledge that the *conciseness* of the History of the Scripture has concealed from us those Fundamental Doctrines, which our Saviour and his Apostles Preach'd; but the Sacred Historians thought fit by consent, for unconceivable Reasons, to leave out in the Narrative they give us, of those Preachings? This Passage here wholly confuteth that. They could Preach nothing, but what they were sent to Preach: And that we see is contain'd in these few words, *Preach, saying the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand. Heal the Sick, cleanse the Lepers, raise the Dead, cast out Devils*, i. e. Acquaint them, that the Kingdom of the *Messiah* is come, and let them know by the Miracles, you do in my Name, that I am that King and Deliverer they expect. If there were any other necessary Articles, that were to be believed, for the saving of the *lost Sheep* they were sent to, can one think that *St. Matthew*, who sets down so minutely every Circumstance of their Commission, would have omitted the
most

most important, and material of it? He was an ear Witness, and one that was sent; And so (without supposing him inspired) could not be misled by the short account he might receive from others, who by their own, or others forgetfulness might have drop'd those other Fundamental Articles, that the Apostles were order'd to Preach.

The very like account St. *Luke* gives us of our Saviours Commission to the Seventy, *Ch. X. 1, --- 16.* *After these things the Lord appointed other Seventy also, and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place whither he himself would come. Therefore said he unto them, The harvest truly is great, but the labourers are few: Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth labourers into his harvest. Go your ways: behold, I send you forth as Lambs among Wolves. Carry neither purse, nor scrip, nor shoes: and salute no man by the way. And into whatsoever house ye enter, first say, Peace be to this house. And if the son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon it; if not, it shall return to you again.*

A Second Vindication of the

again. And in the same house remain eating and drinking such things as they give : for the labourer is worthy of his hire. Go not from house to house. And into whatsoever city ye enter and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you. And heal the sick that are therein, and SAT UNTO THEM, THE KINGDOM OF GOD IS COME NIGH UNTO YOU. But in whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you not, go your ways out into the streets of the same and say, Even the very dust of your city which cleaveth on us, we do wipe off against you : Notwithstanding, be ye sure of this, that the Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you. But I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable in that day for Sodom than for that city. Wo unto thee Chorazin, Wo unto thee Bethsaida : For if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon, which have been done in you, they had a great while ago repented, sitting in sackcloth and ashes. But it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the judgment than for you. And thou Capernaum, which art exalted to Heaven, shalt be thrust down to Hell. He that heareth

heareth you, heareth me : and he that despiseth you despiseth me : and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.

Our Saviour's Commission here to the Seventy, whom he sent to Preach, is so exactly conformable to that which he had before given to the Twelve Apostles, that there needs but this one thing more to be observed, to convince any one, that they were sent to convert their Hearers to this sole belief, that the Kingdom of the *Messiah* was come, and that *Jesus* was the *Messiah*. And that the Historians of the New Testament are not so *concise* in their account of this Matter, that they would have omitted any other necessary Articles of Belief, that had been given the Seventy in Commission. That which I mean is, the *Kingdom of the Messiah* is twice mentioned in it to be come, *v. 9. & 11.* If there were other Articles given them by our Saviour to propose to their Hearers, *St. Luke* must be very fond of this one Article, when for *conciseness* sake, leaving out the other Fundamental Articles that our Saviour

A Second Vindication of the

Saviour gave them in charge to Preach, he repeats this more than once.

The *Unmasker's* Third Particular, p. 76. begins thus; *This also must be thought of, that though there are several parts and members of the Christian Faith, yet they do not all occur in any one place of Scripture.* Something is in it (whether owing to his Will, or Understanding, I shall not enquire) that the *Unmasker* always delivers himself in doubtful, and ambiguous terms. It had been as easie for him to have said, There are several Articles of the Christian Faith, necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, as to say (as he does here) *There are several parts and members of the Christian Faith.* But as an evidence of the clearness of his Notions, or the fairness of his Arguing, he always rests in generals. *There are, I grant, several parts and members of the Christian Faith, which do no more occur in any one place of Scripture, than the whole New Testament can be said to occur in any one place of Scripture.* For every Proposition deliver'd

deliver'd in the New Testament for Divine Revelation, is *a part and member of the Christian Faith*. But 'tis not those *parts and members of the Christian Faith* we are speaking of; But only such *parts and members of the Christian Faith*, as are absolutely necessary to be believed by every Man, before he can be a Christian. And in that sense I deny his Assertion to be true, *viz.* That they do not occur in any one place of Scripture. For they do all occur in that first Sermon of St. Peter, Act. II. 11. by which Three Thousand were at that time brought into the Church, and that in these words, *Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom you have Crucified, Lord and Christ. Repent and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ.* Here is the Doctrine of Jesus the *Messiah*, the *Lord*, and of *Repentance* propos'd, to those who already believe one God; Which I say, are all the parts of the Christian Faith necessary to be received to make a Man a Christian. To suppose, as the *Unmasker* does here, that
more

more is required, is to beg, not prove the Question.

If he disputes this Collection of mine out of that Sermon of *St. Peter*, I will give him a more authentick Collection of the necessary parts of the Christian Faith from an Author that he will not question. Let him look into *Act. 20.20, &c.* and there he will find *St. Paul* saying thus to the Elders of *Ephesus*, whom he was taking his last leave of, with an Assurance, that he should never see them again. *I have kept back nothing that was profitable unto you. But have shew'd you, and have taught you publickly and from house to house, testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ.* If *St. Paul* knew what was necessary to make a Christian, here it is: Here he (if he knew how to do it, for 'tis plain from his words he designed to do it) has put it together. But there is a greater yet than *St. Paul*, who has brought all the parts of Faith necessary to Salvation into one place, I mean our Saviour himself, *Joh. XVII.*

13. in these words. *This is Life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.*

But the *Unmasker* goes on. *Therefore when in some places, only one single part of the Christian Faith is made mention of, as necessarily to be imbrac'd in order to Salvation, we must be careful not to take it alone, but to supply it from several other Places, which make mention of other necessary and indispensable points of belief. I will give the Reader a plain instance of this, Rom. X. 9. If thou shalt believe in thy heart, that God hath rais'd him (i. e. the Lord Jesus) from the dead thou shalt be saved. Here one Article of Faith, viz. the belief of Christ's resurrection (because it is of so great Importance in Christianity) is only mention'd: But all the rest must be supposed, because they are mention'd in other places.*

Answ. One would wonder that any one conversant in holy Writ, with ever so little Attention; much more that an Expounder of the Scriptures should so mistake the sense and stile of the Scripture.

Scripture. Believing *Jesus* to be the *Messiah* with a lively Faith, *i. e.* as have shew'd, taking him to be our King, with a sincere submission to the Laws of his Kingdom, is all that is required to make a Man a Christian; for this includes repentance too. The believing him therefore to be the *Messiah*, is very often, and with great reason, put both for Faith and Repentance too; which are sometimes set down singly, where one is put for both, as implying the other: And sometimes they are both mention'd; and then Faith, as contradistinguish'd from Repentance, is taken for a simple Assent of the mind to this Truth that *Jesus* is the *Messiah*. Now this Faith is variously expressed in Scripture.

There are some particulars in the History of our Saviour allow'd to be so peculiarly appropriated to the *Messiah*, such incommunicable marks of him, that to believe them of *Jesus* of *Nazareth* was in effect the same as to believe him to be the *Messiah*; and so are put to express it. The principal of these is his Resurrection from the dead, which being the great

and demonstrative Proof of his being the *Messiah*, 'tis not at all strange, that the believing his Resurrection should be put for believing him to be the *Messiah*: Since the declaring his Resurrection was a declaring him to be the *Messiah*. For thus St. Paul argues, *Act. XIII. 32, 33. We declare unto you good tidings, or we preach the Gospel to you, for so the word signifies, how that the promise that was made unto the Fathers, God hath fullfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again.* The force of which Argument lies in this, that if *Jesus* was raised from the dead, then he was certainly the *Messiah*: And thus the promise of the *Messiah* was fullfilled in raising *Jesus* from the dead. The like Argument St. Paul useth, *1 Cor. XV. 17. If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain, you are yet in your Sins. i. e. If Jesus be not risen from the dead, he is not the Messiah, your believing it is in vain, and you will receive no benefit by that Faith.* And so likewise from the same Argument of his Resurrection, he at *Thessalonica* proves him

to be the *Messiah*, *Act. XVII. 2, 3.* And Paul, as his manner was, went into the Synagogue, and three Sabbath Days reasoned with the Jews out of the Scriptures, opening and alledging that the *Messiah* must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead: And that this *Jesus* whom I preach unto you is the *Messiah*.

The necessary Connection of these two, that if he rose from the dead he was the *Messiah*; And if he rose not from the dead he was not the *Messiah*; The chief Priest and Pharisees, that had prosecuted him to Death, understood very well, who therefore came together unto Pilate saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, whilst he was yet alive, after three days I will rise again. Command therefore that the Sepulchre be made sure unto the third day, lest his disciples come by night and steal him away, and say unto the people, he is risen from the dead: So the last error shall be worse than the first. The error they here speak of, 'tis plain, was the opinion, that he was the *Messiah*. To stop that Belief, which his Miracles had procured

procured him amongst the People, they had got him put to Death: But if after that, it should be believed, that he rose again from the dead, this demonstration that he was the *Messiah*, would but establish what they had laboured to destroy, by his Death: Since no one, who believed his Resurrection, could doubt of his being the *Messiah*.

'Tis not at all therefore to be wonder'd, that his Resurrection, his Ascension, his Rule and Dominion, and his coming to judge the quick and the dead, which are Characteristical marks of the *Messiah*, and belong peculiarly to him, should sometimes in Scripture be put alone as sufficient descriptions of the *Messiah*; And the believing them of him put for believing him to be the *Messiah*. Thus, *Acts X.* our Saviour in *Peter's* Discourse to *Cornelius*, when he brought him the Gospel, is describ'd to be the *Messiah*, by his Miracles, Death, Resurrection, Dominion, and coming to judge the quick and the dead.

A Second Vindication of the

These, (which in my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, I have upon this ground taken the Liberty to call *concomitant Articles*) where they are set alone for the Faith to which Salvation is promis'd, plainly signifie the believing *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, that Fundamental Article which has the promise of Life ; And so give no Foundation at all for what the *Unmasker* says, in these words, *Here one Article of Faith, viz. The belief of Christ's Resurrection (because it is of so great Importance in Christianity) is only mention'd; but all the rest must be suppos'd, because they are mention'd in other places.*

Answ. If all the rest be of absolute, and indispensable Necessity to be believed to make a Man a Christian, *all the rest* are every one of them of equal importance. For things of equal Necessity to any end, are of equal Importance to that end. But here the Truth forced its way unawares from the *Unmasker*. Our Saviour's Resurrection, for the reason I have given, is truly of great importance in Christianity ; so great, that his being
or

or not being the *Messiah* stands or falls with it: So that these two *important Articles* are inseparable, and in effect make but one. For since that time, believe one and you believe both; Deny one of them and you can believe neither. If the *Unmasker* can shew me any *one* of the Articles in his List, which is not of this *great importance* mention'd alone with a promise of Salvation for believing it, I will grant him to have some colour for what he says here. But where is to be found in the Scripture any such Expression as this; If thou shalt believe with thy heart *the corruption and degeneracy of humane nature*, thou shalt be saved? or the like? This place therefore out of the *Romans* makes not for, but against his List of necessary Articles. One of them alone he cannot shew me any where set down, with a *Supposition* of the rest, as having Salvation promis'd to it. Though it be true, that that one which alone is absolutely necessary to be superadded to the Belief of one God, is in divers places differently expressed.

That which he subjoins, as a Consequence of what he had said, is a farther Proof of this. *And consequently,* says he, *if we would give an impartial account of our belief, we must consult those places: And they are not all together, but dispersed here and there: Wherefore we must look them out, and acquaint our selves with the several particulars, which make up our belief, and render it entire and consummate.*

Answ. Never was Man constanter to a loose way of talking. The Question is only about Articles necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian: And here he talks of the *several particulars, which make up our belief, and render it entire and consummate;* Confounding as he did before *essential and integral* parts, which it seems he cannot distinguish. Our Faith is true and saving, when it is such as God by the new Covenant requires it to be: But it is not *entire and consummate,* till we explicitly believe all the Truths contained in the Word of God. For the whole Revelation of Truth in the Scripture, being the proper and entire Object of Faith.
Our

Our Faith cannot be *entire* and *consummate*, till it be adequate to its proper Object, which is the whole divine Revelation contain'd in the Scripture: And so to make our Faith *entire* and *consummate*, we must *not look out those places*, which he says, *are not all together*. To talk of *looking out*, and culling of places is Nonsense, where the whole Scripture alone can *make up our belief*, and *render it entire and consummate*: Which no one, I think, can hope for in this frail State of Ignorance and Error. To make the *Unmasker* speak Sense, and to the purpose, here, we must understand him thus. *That if we will give an impartial Account* of the Articles, that are necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, *we must consult those places* where they are, *for they are not all together, but dispersed here and there, wherefore we must look them out*, and acquaint our selves with the several particulars *which make up the Fundamental Articles of our belief*, and will render a Catalogue of them *entire and consummate*. If his Supposition be true, I grant his Method to be reason-

nable, and upon that I join issue with him. Let him thus *give us an impartial Account of our belief*: Let him *acquaint us with the several particulars, which make up a Christian's belief, and render it entire and consummate*. Till he has done this, let him not talk thus in the air of a Method, that will not do: Let him not reproach me, as he does, for not taking a *course*, by which he himself cannot do, what he reviles me for failing in. But our hasty Author, says he, took another course, and thereby deceived himself and unhappily deceived others. If it be so, I desire the *Unmasker* to take the course he proposes, and thereby undeceive me, and others; and acquaint us with the several particulars which make up a Christian's belief, and render it entire and consummate. For I am willing to be undeceived: But till he has done that, and shewn us by the success of it, that his course is better, he cannot blame us for following that course we have done.

I come now to his Fourth and last particular, p. 78. which he says, is the main Answer to the Objection, and therefore I shall

shall set it down in his own words entire as it stands together. *This*, says he, *must be born in our Minds, that Christianity was erected by degrees, according to that Prediction and Promise of our Saviour, that the Spirit should teach them all things, Joh. XIV. 26. and that he should guide them into all truth, Joh. XVI. 13. viz. after his departure and ascension, when the Holy Ghost was to be sent in a special manner to enlighten Mens minds, and to discover to them the great Mysteries of Christianity. This is to be noted by us, as that which gives great light in the present case. The discovery of the Doctrines of the Gospel was gradual. It was by certain steps that Christianity climbed to its height. We are not to think then that all the necessary Doctrines of the Christian Religion were clearly publish'd to the World in our Saviour's time. Not but that all that were necessary for that time were publish'd: But some which were necessary for the succeeding one were not then discover'd or at least not fully. They had ordinarily no belief, before Christ's Death and Resurrection, of those Substantial Articles,*

cles, i. e. that he should die and rise again; But we read in the Acts, and in the Epistles, that these were formal Articles of Faith afterwards, and are ever since necessary to compleat the Christian belief. So as to other great Verities, the Gospel increased by degrees, and was not perfect at once. Which furnishes us with a reason why most of the choicest and sublimest truths of Christianity are to be met with in the Epistles of the Apostles, they being such Doctrines as were not clearly discover'd and open'd in the Gospels and the Acts. Thus far the Unmasker.

I thought hitherto, that the Covenant of Grace in Christ Jesus had been but one, immutably the same: But our *Unmasker* here makes two, or I know not how many. For I cannot tell how to conceive, that the Conditions of any Covenant should be changed, and the Covenant remain the same: Every change of Conditions in my apprehension makes a new and another Covenant. We are not to think, says the *Unmasker*, *That all the necessary Doctrines of the Christian Religion were clearly publish'd*

to the World in our Saviour's time; not but that all that were necessary for that time were publish'd: But some which were necessary for the Succeeding one, were not then discover'd; or at least not fully.

Answ. The *Unmasker*, constant to himself, speaks here doubtfully, and cannot tell whether he should say that the Articles necessary to Succeeding times, were discover'd in our Saviour's time, or no: And therefore, that he may provide himself a retreat, in the doubt he is in, he says, *they were not clearly publish'd; they were not then discover'd, or at least not fully.* But we must desire him to pull off his Mask, and to that purpose.

1°. I ask him how he can tell, that all the necessary Doctrines were *obscurely published* or *in part discover'd*; for an obscure publishing, a Discovery in part, is oppos'd to, and intimated in *not clearly published, not fully discover'd.* And if a *clear* and *full* Discovery be all that he denies to them, I ask

XXXVII.

Which those Fundamental Articles are, which were obscurely publish'd, but not fully discovered, in our Saviour's time?

And next, I shall desire him to tell me

XXXVIII.

Whether there are any Articles necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, that were not discover'd at all in our Saviour's time, and which they are.

If he cannot shew these distinctly, it is plain he talks at random about them: But he has no clear and distinct conception of those that were publish'd, or not publish'd; clearly or obscurely discover'd, in our Saviour's time. It was necessary for him to say something, for those his pretended necessary Articles, which are not to be found any where propos'd in the
Preaching

Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles to their yet Unbelieving Auditors; And therefore he says, *We are not to think all the necessary Doctrines of the Christian Religion were clearly published to the World in our Saviour's time.* But he barely says it, without giving any Reason, why *we are not to think so.* It is enough that it is necessary to his Hypothesis. He says *we are not to think so,* and we are presently bound *not to think so.* Else from another Man, that did not usurp an Authority over our Thoughts, it would have requir'd some Reason to make them think, that something more was requir'd to make a Man a Christian after than in our Saviour's time. For, as I take it, it is not a very probable, much less a self-evident Proposition, to be received without Proof, That there was something *necessary for that time,* to make a Man a Christian, and something more that was *necessary* to make a Man a Christian in the *succeeding time.*

However, since this great Master says *we ought to think so,* let us in obedience think so as well as we can; till
 he

he vouchsafes to give us some Reason to think, that there was more requir'd to be believed to make a Man a Christian in the succeeding time, than in our Saviour's. This, instead of removing, does but increase the Difficulty: For if more were necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian after our Saviour's time, than was during his life; how comes it, that no more was propos'd by the Apostles in their Preaching to Unbelievers for the making them Christians, after our Saviour's Death, than there was before: Even this one Article, that he was the *Messiah*? For I desire the *Unmasker* to shew me any of those other Articles mentioned in his List (except the Resurrection and Ascension of our Saviour, which were intervening Matters of Fact, evidencing him to be the *Messiah*) that were propos'd by the Apostles after our Saviour's time to their Unbelieving Hearers, to make them Christians. This one Doctrine, that *Jesus* was the *Messiah*, was that, which was propos'd in our Saviour's time to be believed, as necessary to make a Man a Christian: The same Doctrine
was

was likewise what was propos'd afterwards, in the Preaching of the Apostles to Unbelievers, to make them Christians.

I grant this was more *clearly* propos'd after than in our Saviour's time; But in both of them it was all that was propos'd to the Believers of one God, to make them Christians. Let him shew, that there were any other propos'd in or after our Saviour's time to be believed, to make Unbelievers Christians. If he means by *necessary Articles published to the World*, the other Doctrines contain'd in the Epistles; I grant they are all of them necessary Articles to be believed by every Christian, as far as he understands them. But I deny, that they were propos'd to those they were writ to, as necessary to make them Christians, for this demonstrative Reason: Because they were Christians already. For Example, many Doctrines proving, and explaining, and giving a farther Light into the Gospel, are publish'd in the Epistles to the *Corinthians* and *Thessalonians*. These are all of Divine Authority, and none of them may be dis-

disbelieved by any one who is a Christian : But yet what was propos'd or publish'd to both the *Corinthians* and *Thessalonians* to make them Christians, was only this Doctrine that *Jesus* was the *Messiah* : As may be seen, *Act. XVII.* and *XVIII.* This then was the Doctrine necessary to make men Christians in our Saviour's time ; And this the only Doctrine necessary to make Unbelievers Christians after our Saviour's time. The only difference was, that it was more clearly propos'd after than before his Ascension : The Reason whereof has been sufficiently explain'd. But any other Doctrine but this, propos'd clearly or obscurely, in or after our Saviour's time, as necessary to be believed to make Unbelievers Christians, That remains yet to be shewn.

When the *Unmasker* speaks of the Doctrines that were necessary for the *succeeding time* after our Saviour, he is in doubt whether he should say they were, or were not *discover'd* in our Saviour's time ; and how far they were then *discover'd* : And therefore he says, *some of them were not then discover'd.*

cover'd, or at least not fully. We must here excuse the doubtfulness of his talking concerning the discovery of his other necessary Articles. For how could he say they were discover'd, or not discover'd, clearly or obscurely, fully or not fully, when he does not yet know them all, nor can tell us, what those necessary Articles are? If he does know them let him give us a List of them, and then we shall see easily whether they were at all publish'd or discover'd in our Saviour's time. If there are some of them, that were not at all discover'd in our Saviour's time, let him speak it out, and leave shifting: And if some of those, that were *not necessary for our Saviour's time, but for the succeeding one* only were yet discover'd in our Saviour's time, why were they not necessary to be believed in that time? But the truth is, he knows not what these Doctrines necessary for Succeeding times are, and therefore can say nothing positive about their Discovery. And for those that he has set down, as soon as he shall name any one of them, to be of the number of those *not necessary for*

our Saviour's time, but necessary for the Succeeding one, it will presently appear, either that it was discover'd in our Saviour's time; And then it was as necessary for his time as the Succeeding: Or else that it was not discover'd in his time, nor to several Converts after his time, before they were made Christians; And therefore it was no more necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian in the Succeeding, than it was in our Saviour's time. However, general Positions and Distinctions without a Foundation, serve for shew, and to beguile unwary and inattentive Readers.

2°. Having thus minded him that the Question is about Articles of Faith necessary to be explicitly and distinctly believed to make a Man a Christian; I then, in the next place, demand of him to tell me,

XXXIX.

Whether or no all the Articles necessary now to be distinctly and explicitly believed to make any Man a Christian, were distinctly and explicitly published or discover'd in our Saviour's time.

And

And then I shall desire to know
of him,

XL.

A Reason why they were not.

Those that he instances in of *Christ's Death and Resurrection*, will not help him one jot : For they are not new Doctrines revealed, new Mysteries discovered; but Matters of Fact, which happen'd to our Saviour in their due time, to compleat in him the Character and Predictions of the *Messiah*, and demonstrate him to be the Deliverer promised. These are recorded of him by the Spirit of God in holy Writ; but are no more necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, than any other part of Divine Revelation, but as far as they have an immediate Connexion with his being the *Messiah*, and cannot be denied without denying him to be the *Messiah*: And therefore this Article of his Resurrection (which supposes his Death) and such other Propositions as are convertible with his being the *Messiah*, are,

as they very well may be, put for his being the *Messiah*; and as I have shew'd, propos'd to be believed in the place of it.

All that is reveal'd in Scripture has a consequential necessity of being believed by all those, to whom it is propos'd : Because it is of Divine Authority, one part as much as another. And in this sense, all the Divine Truths in the inspired Writings are Fundamental and necessary to be believed. But then this will destroy our *Unmasker's* select Number of Fundamental Articles : And *the choicest and sublimest Truths of Christianity*, which he tells us, *are to be met with in the Epistles*, will not be more necessary to be believed, than any, which he may think the commonest or meanest Truths in any of the Epistles or the Gospels. Whatsoever part of Divine Revelation, whether reveal'd before, or in, or after our Saviour's time; whether it contain (according to the distinction of our *Unmasker's* nice palate) *choice* or common; *sublime* or not sublime Truths; is necessary to be believed by every one, to whom it is propos'd,

propos'd, as far as he understands, what is propos'd. But God by *Jesus Christ* has entred into a Covenant of Grace with Mankind ; a Covenant of Faith, instead of that of Works, wherein some Truths are absolutely necessary to be explicitly believed by them to make Men Christians ; and therefore those Truths are necessary to be known, and consequently necessary to be propos'd to them to make them Christians. This is peculiar to them to make Men Christians. For all Men, as Men, are under a necessary obligation to believe what God proposes to them to be believed : But there being certain distinguishing Truths, which belong to the Covenant of the Gospel, which if Men know not, they cannot be Christians ; and they being some of them such as cannot be known without being propos'd ; those and those only are the necessary Doctrines of Christianity I speak of ; without a knowledge of, and assent to which, no Man can be a Christian.

To come therefore to a clear decision of this Controversie, I desire the *Unmasker* to tell me,

XLI.

What those Doctrines are which are absolutely necessary to be proposed to every Man to make him a Christian.

XLII.

1^o. Whether they are all the Truths of Divine Revelation contain'd in the Bible.

For, I grant his Argument (which in another place he uses for some of them, and truly belongs to them all) viz. That they were reveal'd and written there on purpose to be believed, and that it is indispensibly necessary for Christians to believe them.

XLIII.

2^o. Or whether it be only that one Article of Jesus being the Messiah, which the History of our Saviour and his Apostles Preaching has with such a peculiar distinction every where propos'd.

XLIV.

XLIV.

3°. *Or whether the Doctrines necessary to be propos'd to every one to make him a Christian, be any set of Truths between these two.*

And if he says this latter, then I must ask him,

XLV.

What they are? that we may see why those rather than any other contain'd in the New Testament, are necessary to be propos'd to every Man to make him a Christian; And if they are not every one propos'd to him, and assented to by him, he cannot be a Christian.

The *Unmasker* makes a great noise, and hopes to give his unwary, though well-meaning Readers, odd Thoughts, and strong Impressions against my Book, by declaiming against my *lank Faith*, and my *narrowing* of Christianity to one Article; which, as he says,

is the next way to reduce it to *none*. But when it is consider'd, it will be found, that 'tis he that narrows Christianity. The *Unmasker*, as if he were Arbiter and Dispenser of the Oracles of God, takes upon him to single out some Texts of Scripture; and, where the words of Scripture will not serve his turn, to impose on us his Interpretations and Deductions as necessary Articles of Faith; which is in Effect to make them of equal Authority with the unquestionable Word of God. And thus, partly in the words of the Scripture, and partly in words of his own, he makes a Set of Fundamentals, *with an Exclusion* of all the other Truths deliver'd, by the Spirit of God in the Bible: Though all the rest be of the same Divine Authority, and Original; and ought therefore all equally, as far as they are understood, by every Christian to be believed. I tell him, and I desire him to take notice of it: God has no where given him an Authority thus to garble the inspired Writings of the Holy Scriptures. Every part of it is his Word, and ought every part of it to be believed

lieved by every Christian Man, according as God shall enable him to understand it. It ought not to be narrowed to the Cut of the *Unmasker's* peculiar System : 'Tis a Presumption of the highest Nature, for him thus to pretend according to his own Phancy to establish a Set of Fundamental Articles. This is to diminish the Authority of the Word of God, to set up his own ; and create a reverence to his System, from which the several parts of Divine Revelations are to receive their Weight, Dignity and Authority. Those Passages of Holy Writ which suit with that, are *Fundamental, Choice, Sublime* and *Necessary* : The rest of the Scripture (as of no great moment) is not Fundamental, is not necessary to be believed, may be neglected, or must be tortur'd to comply with an Analogy of Faith of his own making. But though he pretend to a certain Set of Fundamentals ; yet to shew the Vanity, and Impudence of that pretence, he cannot tell us which they are ; and therefore in vain contends for a Creed he knows not, and is yet no where. He neither does, and which is more, I
tell

tell him he never can give us a Collection of his Fundamentals gather'd upon his Principles out of the Scripture, with the rejection of all the rest as not Fundamental. He does not observe the difference there is between what is necessary to be believed by every Man to make him a Christian, and what is requir'd to be believed by every Christian. The first of these is what by the Covenant of the Gospel is necessary to be known, and consequently to be propos'd to every Man to make him a Christian: The latter is no less than the whole Revelation of God; all the Divine Truths contain'd in Holy Scripture; which every Christian Man is under a necessity to believe, so far as it shall please God upon his serious and constant endeavours to enlighten his Mind to understand them.

The Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles, has sufficiently taught us what is necessary to be propos'd to every Man to make him a Christian. He that believes him to be the promised *Messiah*, takes *Jesus* for his King, and repenting of his former Sins, sincerely

cerely resolves to live for the future in obedience to his Laws is a Subject of his Kingdom, is a Christian. If he be not, I desire the *Unmasker* to tell me, what more is requisite to make him so. Till he does that, I rest satisfied, that this is all that was at first, and is still necessary to make a Man a Christian.

This, though it be contain'd in a few words, and those not hard to be understood ; though it be in one voluntary act of the Mind relinquishing all irregular Courses, and submitting it self to the rule of him, whom God had sent to be our King, and promised to be our Saviour ; Yet it having relation to the Race of Mankind from the First Man *Adam* to the End of the World, it being a Contrivance, wherein God has displaid so much of his Wisdom and Goodness to the corrupt and lost Sons of Men, and it being a Design to which the Almighty had a peculiar regard in the whole Constitution and Oeconomy of the *Jews*, as well as in the Prophecies and History of the Old Testament ; This was a Foundation capable of large Superstructures.

structures. 1. In explaining the Occasion, Necessity, Use and End of his coming. 2. Next, in proving him to be the Person promis'd; by a Correspondence of his Birth, Life, Sufferings, Death, and Resurrection, to all those Prophecies and Types of him, which had given the expectation of such a Deliverer, and to those Descriptions of him whereby he might be known, when he did come. 3. In the discovery of the Sort, Constitution, Extent, and Management of his Kingdom. 4. In shewing from what we are deliver'd by him, and how that Deliverance is wrought out, and what are the Consequences of it.

These, and a great many more the like, afford great numbers of Truths deliver'd both in the Historical, Epistolary, and Prophetical Writings of the New Testament, wherein the Mysteries of the Gospel hidden from former Ages were discover'd; and that more fully, I grant, after the pouring out of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles. But could no body take Christ for their promised King, and resolve to obey him, unless he understood all the

the Truths that concern'd his Kingdom, or, as I may say, Mysteries of State of it? The truth of the contrary is manifest out of the plain and uniform Preaching of the Apostles, after they had received the Holy Ghost, that was to guide them into all Truth. Nay, after the writing of those Epistles, wherein were contain'd the *Unmasker's Sublimest Truths*; They every where propos'd to Unbelievers *Jesus the Messiah* to be their King, *Ordain'd* of God; and to this join'd Repentance: And this alone they Preach'd for the Conversion of their Unbelieving Hearers. As soon as any one assented to this, he was pronounced a Believer; And these inspired Rulers of the Church, these infallible Preachers of the Gospel, admitted him into Christ's Kingdom by Baptism. And this after, long *after our Saviour's Ascension, when* (as our *Unmasker* expresses it) *the Holy Ghost was to be sent in a special manner to enlighten mens Minds, and to discover to them the great Mysteries of Christianity*, even as long as the Apostles lived: And what others were to do, who afterwards were to Preach

Preach the Gospel; St. Paul tells us, 1 Cor. III. 11. *Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, even Jesus the Messiah.* Though upon this Foundation Men might build variously, things that would, or would not hold the touch; Yet however, as long as they kept firm to this Foundation, they should be saved, as appears in the following Verses.

And indeed, if all the Doctrines of the Gospel, which are contain'd in the Writings of the Apostles and Evangelists, were necessary to be understood, and explicitly believed, in the true sense of those that deliver'd them, to make a Man a Christian; I doubt whether ever any one, even to this day, was a true Christian: Though I believe the *Unmasker* will not deny but that, e're this, Christianity (as he expresses it) *is by certain steps climbed to its height.*

But for this, the *Unmasker* has found a convenient and wise remedy. 'Tis but for him to have the Power to declare, which of the Doctrines deliver'd in Holy Writ are, and which are not necessary to be believed, with an
addi.

additional Power to add others of his own, that he cannot find there, and the business is done. For unless this be allow'd him, his System cannot stand: Unless his Interpretations be received for authentick Revelation, we cannot have all Doctrines necessary for our time; In truth, we cannot be Christians. For to this only, what he says concerning the *gradual discovery of the Doctrines of the Gospel tends*. *We are not to think, says he, that all the necessary Doctrines of the Christian Religion were clearly publish'd to the World in our Saviour's time. Not but that all that were necessary for that time were publish'd: But some that were necessary for the succeeding one were not then discover'd, or at least not fully.*

I must here ask the *Unmasker* a short Question, or two; as First,

XLVI.

Are not all the Doctrines necessary for our time contain'd in his System?

Next,

Next,

XLVII.

Can all the Doctrines necessary for our time, be propos'd in the express words of the Scripture ?

When he has answer'd these two plain Questions (and an Answer to them, I shall expect) the World will then see, what he designs by *Doctrines necessary for our Saviour's time, and Doctrines necessary for succeeding times*; whether he means any thing else by it, but the setting up his System, as the exact Standard of the Gospel; and the true and unalterable Measure of Christianity, in which *it has climbed to its height*.

Let not good and sincere Christians be deceived, nor perplexed by this Maker of another Christianity, than what the infallible Spirit of God has left us in the Scriptures. 'Tis evident from thence, that whoever takes *Jesus the Messiah* for his King, with a Resolution to live by his Laws, and does sincerely repent as often as he transgresses any of them, is his Subject ;

All

All such are Christians. What they are to know, or believe more concerning him, and his Kingdom, when they are his Subjects, he has left upon Record in the great and Sacred Code, and Constitutions of his Kingdom, I mean in the Holy Scriptures. All that is contain'd therein, as coming from the God of Truth, they are to receive as Truth, and imbrace as such. But since it is impossible explicitly to believe any Proposition of the Christian Doctrine but what men understand, or in any other sense than we understand it to have been deliver'd in; An explicit belief is, or can be required in no Man, of more than what he understands of that Doctrine. And thus, whatsoever upon fair Endeavours, he understands to be contain'd in that Doctrine, is necessary to him to be believed: Nor can he continue a Subject of Christ upon other terms.

What he is perswaded is the meaning of Christ his King, in any Expression he finds in the Sacred Code; That by his Allegiance he is bound to submit his Mind to receive for true,
Y or

or else he denies the Authority of Christ, and refuses to believe him; nor can be excused by calling any one on Earth Master. And hence it is evidently impossible for a Christian to understand any Text in one sence, and believe it in another, by whomsoever dictated.

All that is contain'd in the inspired Writings, is all of Divine Authority, must all be allow'd for such, and received for Divine and infallible Truth, by every Subject of Christ's Kingdom, *i. e.* every Christian. How comes then the *Unmasker* to distinguish these Dictates of the Holy Spirit into necessary and not necessary Truths? I desire him to produce his Commission, whereby he hath the Power given him to tell, which of the Divine Truths contain'd in the Holy Scripture are of necessity to be believed, and which not. Who made him a Judge or Divider between them? Who gave him this Power over the Oracles of God; to set up one, and debase another at his pleasure? Some, as he thinks fit, are the *choicest* Truths. And what I beseech him are the other? Who made

made him a Chuser, where no body can pick and chuse? Every proposition there, as far as any Christian can understand it, is indispensibly necessary to be believed: And farther than he does understand it, it is impossible for him to believe it. The Laws of Christ's Kingdom do not require Impossibilities, for they are all reasonable, just and good.

Some of the Truths delivered in Holy Writ are very plain: 'Tis impossible, I think, to mistake their Meaning: And those certainly are all necessary to be explicitly believ'd. Others have more Difficulty in them, and are not easy to be understood: Is the *Unmasker* appointed Christ's Vicegerent here, or the Holy Ghost's Interpreter, with Authority to pronounce which of these are necessary to be believ'd; and in what Sense, and which not? The Obscurity that is to be found in several passages of the Scripture, the difficulties that cover and perplex the meaning of several Texts, demand of every Christian Study, Diligence, and Attention; in reading and hearing the Scriptures;

Y 2

in

A Second Vindication of the

in comparing, and examining them; and receiving what light he can from all manner of helps, to understand these Books wherein are contain'd the Words of Life. This the *Unmaker*, and every one is to do for himself; and thereby find out, what is necessary for him to believe. But I do not know that the *Unmasker* is to understand, and interpret for me, more than I for him. If he has such a power I desire him to produce it. Till then I can acknowledge no other infallible, but that guide, which he directs me to himself here in these Words, *According to our Saviour's promise, the Holy Ghost was to be sent in a special manner to enlighten mens minds, and to discover to them the great mysteries of Christianity.* For whether by *men* he here means those on whom the Holy Ghost was so eminently poured out, *Act. II.* Or whether he means by these Words, that special Assistance of the Holy Ghost, whereby particular men to the end of the World, are to be lead into the Truth, by opening their understandings, that they may understand the Scriptures (for he always loves

loves to speak doubtfully and indefinitely) I know no other infallible guide, but the Spirit of God in the Scriptures. Nor has God left it in my choice, to take any Man for such. If he had, I should think the *Unmasker* the unlikeliest to be he, and the last Man in the World to be chosen for that Guide: And herein, I appeal to any sober Christian, who hath read what the *Unmasker* has with so little Truth and Decency (for 'tis not always mens fault if they have not Sense) writ upon this Question, whether he would not be of the same mind?

But yet as very an *Unmasker* as he is, he will be extremely apt to call you Names, nay to declare you no Christian; and boldly affirm you have no Christianity, if you will not swallow it just as it is of his Cooking. You must take it just as he has been pleased to dole it; no more, nor no less, than what is in his System. He hath put himself into the Throne of Christ, and pretends to tell you, which are, and which are not the indispensable Laws of his Kingdom. Which parts of his divine Revelation you must necessarily

Y 3 know,

know, understand, and believe, and in what sense; and which you need not trouble your head about, but may pass by as not necessary to be believed. He will tell you that some of his necessary Articles are Mysteries, and yet (as he does p. 115. of his *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*) that they are easy to be understood by any Man, when explained to him. In answer to that, I demanded of him "who was to explain them? The *Papists* I told him, "would explain some of them one way, and the *Reformed* another; "The *Remonstrants* and *Anti-remonstrants* give them different senses: "And probably the *Trinitarians* and "Unitarians will profess, that they "understand not each other's Explanations." But to this in his reply he has not vouchsafed to give me any answer. Which yet I expect, and I will tell him why; Because as there are different Explainers, there will be different Fundamentals. And therefore, unless he can shew his Authority to be the sole Explainer of Fundamentals, he will in vain make
such

such a pudder about his Fundamentals. Another Explainer, of as good Authority as he, will set up others against them. And what then shall we be the better for all this stir, and noise of Fundamentals? And I desire it may be consider'd how much of the Divisions in the Church, and bloody Persecutions amongst Christians, has been owing to Christianity thus set up against Christianity, in multiplied Fundamentals and Articles, made necessary by the Infallibility of opposite Systems. The *Unmasker's* Zeal wants nothing but Power to make good his to be the only Christianity, for he has found the Apostles Creed to be defective. He is as infallible as the Pope, and another as infallible as he; and where Humane Additions are made to the Terms of the Gospel, Men seldom want Zeal for what is their own.

To conclude; What was sufficient to make a Man a Christian in our Saviour's time, is sufficient still, *viz.* the taking him for our King and Lord, ordained so by God. What was necessary to be believed by all Chri-

stians in our Saviour's time as an indispensable Duty, which they owed to their Lord and Master, was the believing all divine Revelation, as far as every one could understand it: And just so it is still, neither more nor less. This being so, the *Unmasker* may make what use he pleases of his Notion, *That Christianity was erected by Degrees*, it will no way (in that sense in which it is true) turn to the advantage of his select Fundamental necessary Doctrines.

The next Chapter has nothing in it, but his great Bug-bear, whereby he hopes to fright People from Reading my Book, by crying out, *Socinianism, Socinianism*. Whereas I challenge him again to shew one word of *Socinianism* in it. But however it is worth while to write a Book to prove me a *Socinian*. Truly, I did not think myself so considerable, that the World need be troubled about me, whether I were a follower of *Socinus*, *Arminius*, *Calvin*, or any other Leader of a Sect amongst Christians. A Christian I am sure I am, because I believe *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, the King and Saviour

Saviour promised, and sent by God: And as a Subject of his Kingdom, I take the rule of my Faith, and Life, from his Will declar'd and left upon Record in the inspired Writings of the Apostles and Evangelists in the New Testament: Which I endeavour to the utmost of my power, as is my Duty, to understand in their true sense and meaning. To lead me into their true meaning, I know (as I have above declar'd) no infallible Guide, but the same Holy Spirit, from whom these Writings at first came. If the *Unmasker* knows any other infallible Interpreter of Scripture, I desire him to direct me to him. Till then, I shall think it according to my Master's Rule, not to be called, nor to call any Man on Earth *Master*. No Man, I think, has a right to prescribe to my Faith, or Magisterially to impose his Interpretations or Opinions on me: Nor is it material to any one what mine are, any farther than they carry their own Evidence with them. If this, which I think makes me of no Sect, entitles me to the Name of a *Papist*, or a *Socinian*, because the *Un-*
masker

masker thinks these the worst, and most invidious he can give me; and labours to fix them on me for no other reason, but because I will not take him for my *Master on Earth*, and his System for my Gospel; I shall leave him to recommend himself to the World by this Skill, who no doubt will have reason to thank him for the rareness and subtilty of his Discovery. For, I think, I am the first Man, that ever was found out to be at the same time a *Socinian*, and a Factor for *Rome*. But what is too hard for such an *Unmasker*? I must be what he thinks fit. When he pleases a *Papist*, and when he pleases a *Socinian*, and when he pleases a *Mahometan*. And probably, when he has consider'd a little better, an *Atheist*; for I hardly scaped it when he writ last. My Book, he says, hath a tendency to it; and if he can but go on, as he has done hitherto, from Surmises to Certainties, by that time he writes next his Discovery will be advanced, and he will certainly find me an *Atheist*. Only one thing I dare assure him of, that he shall never find, that I treat the things of God or Religion

ligion so, as if I made only a Trade, or a Jest of them. But let us now see how at present he proves me a *Socinian*.

His first Argument is, my not answering for my leaving out, *Matth. XXVIII. 19.* and *John I. 1.* *Pag. 82.* of his *Socinianism Unmask'd*. This he takes to be a Confession, that I am a *Socinian*. I hope he means fairly, and that if it be so on my side, it must be taken for a standing Rule between us, that where any thing is not answer'd, it must be taken for granted. And upon that score, I must desire him to remember some Passages of my *Vindication*, which I have already, and others which I shall mind him of hereafter, which he passed over in Silence, and hath had nothing to say to, which therefore by his own rule, I shall desire the Reader to observe, that he has granted.

This being premised; I must tell the *Unmasker*, that I perceive he reads my Book with the same Understanding that he writes his own. If he had done otherwise, he might have seen, that I had given him a reason for my omission

omission of those two, and other *plain and obvious Passages and famous Testimonies in the Evangelists*, as he calls them, where I say, p. 11. " That if
 " I have left out none of those *Passa-*
 " *ges or Testimonies*, which contain
 " what our Saviour and his Apostles
 " preach'd and required assent to, to
 " make Men Believers, I shall think
 " my Omissions (let them be what
 " they will) no Faults in the present
 " Case. Whatever Doctrines Mr. *Ed-*
 " *wards* would have to be believed, to
 " make a Man a Christian, he will
 " be sure to find them in those *Prea-*
 " *chings and famous Testimonies* of
 " our Saviour and his Apostles I have
 " quoted. And if they are not there,
 " he may rest satisfied, that they were
 " not propos'd by our Saviour and his
 " Apostles, as necessary to be believed
 " to make Men Christ's Disciples".
 From which words, any one but an
Unmasker, would have understood my
 Answer to be, That all that was ne-
 cessary to be believed to make Men
 Christians, might be found in what
 our Saviour and the Apostles propos'd
 to Unbelievers for their Conversion:

But

But the two Passages abovemention'd, as well as a great many others in the Evangelists, being none of those, I had no reason to take notice of them. But the *Unmasker* having out of his good pleasure put it once upon me, as he does in his *Thoughts of the Causes of Atheism*, p. 107. That I was an *Epitomizer of the Evangelical Writings*, though every one may see I make not that my Business, yet 'tis no matter for that, I must always be accountable to that fancy of his. But when he has proved,

XLVIII.

That this is not as just a reason for my omitting them, as several other obvious Passages and famous Testimonies in the Evangelists, which I there mention, for whose Omission he does not blame me.

I will undertake to give him another Reason, which I know not whether he were not better let alone.

The next Proof of my being a *Socinian* is, that I take the Son of God to be

be an expression used to signifie the *Messiah*. *Slichtingius* and *Socinus* understood it so, and therefore I am, the *Unmasker* says, a *Socinian*. Just as good an Argument, as that I believe *Jesus* to be a Prophet; and so do the *Mahometans*, therefore I am a *Mahometan*: Or thus, The *Unmasker* holds that the Apostles Creed does not contain all things necessary to Salvation, and so says *Knot* the Jesuit: Therefore the *Unmasker* is a Papist. Let me turn the Tables, and by the same Argument I am Orthodox again. For two Orthodox, Pious and very Eminent Prelates of our Church, whom when I follow Authorities, I shall prefer to *Slichtingius* and *Socinus*, understand it as I do, and therefore I am Orthodox. Nay, it so falls out, that if it were of force either way, the Argument would weigh most on this side: Since I am not wholly a Stranger to the Writings of these two Orthodox Bishops, but I never read a Page in either of those *Socinians*. The never sufficiently admir'd and valued Archbishop *Tillotson's* words, which I quoted, the *Unmasker* says, *do not necessarily*

cessarily import any such thing. I know no words that necessarily import any thing to a Caviller. But he was known to have such clear Thoughts, and so clear a Stile; so far from having any thing doubtful, or fallacious in what he said, that I shall only set down his words as they are in his Sermon of Sincerity, p. 2. to shew his meaning. Nathaniel, says he, *being satisfied, that he [our Saviour] was the Messiah, he presently owned him for such, calling him THE SON OF GOD, and the King of Israel.*

The words of the other Eminent Prelate, the Bishop of Ely, whom our Church is still happy in, are these. *To be the Son of God, and to be Christ, being but different Expressions of the same thing : Witness, p. 14. And p. 10. It is the very same thing to believe that Jesus is the Christ, and to believe that Jesus is the Son of God, express it how you please. This ALONE is the Faith which can regenerate a man, and put a divine Spirit into him, that it makes him a Conqueror over the World as Jesus was. Of this the Unmasker says, that this*
Reve-

Reverend Author *speaking only in a general way represents these two as the same thing, viz. That Jesus is the Christ, and that Jesus is the Son of God, because these Expressions are applied to the same person, and because they are both comprehended in one general Name, viz. Jesus.* Answ. The Question is whether these two Expressions, *the Son of God, and the Messiah,* in the Learned Bishop's Opinion signify the same thing. If his Opinion had been asked in the Point, I know not how he could have declar'd it more clearly. For he says they are *Expressions of the same thing, and that it is the very same thing to believe that Jesus is the Messiah, and to believe that he is the Son of God ;* Which cannot be so, if *Messiah* and *Son of God* have different Significations : For then they will make two distinct Propositions in different Sences, which it can be no more the same thing to believe, than it is the same thing to believe that Mr. *Edwards* is a Notable Preacher, and a Notable Railer ; or than it is to believe one Truth and all Truths. For by the same Reason, that it is the *same thing to believe*

two

two distinct Truths, it will be the same thing to believe two thousand distinct Truths, and consequently all Truths. The *Unmasker*, that he might seem to say something, says that the *Reverend Author* represents these as the same thing. *Answ.* The *Unmasker* never fails, like *Midas*, to turn every thing he touches into his own Metal. The Learned Bishop says very directly and plainly, that *to be the Son of God*, and *to be the Messiah*, are Expressions of the same thing: And the *Unmasker* says, he represents these Expressions as one thing. For 'tis of Expressions that both the Bishop and he speak: Now, Expressions can be one thing, but one of these two ways: Either in Sound, and so these two Expressions are not one; Or in signification, and so they are. And then the *Unmasker* says, but in other words, what the Bishop had said before, viz. That these two *to be the Son of God* and *to be the Messiah*, are Expressions of the same thing. Only the *Unmasker* has put in the word *Represents* to amuse his Reader, as if he had said something, and so indeed he does after his fashion, i. e. obscurely

and fallaciously ; which when it comes to be examined, is but the same thing under shew of a difference : Or else, if it has a different meaning, is demonstratively false. But so it be obscure enough to deceive a willing Reader, who will not be at the pains to examine what he says, it serves his turn.

But yet, as if he had said something of weight, he gives Reasons for putting *Represents these two Expressions as one thing*, in stead of saying, these two are *but different Expressions of the same thing*.

The First of his Reasons is, Because the Reverend Author is here *speaking only in a General way*. *Answ.* What does the *Unmasker* mean by a *General way*? The Learned Bishop speaks of two particular *Expressions* applied to our Saviour. But was his Discourse never so general, how could that alter the plain Signification of his words, *viz.* That those two are but *different Expressions of the same thing*?

2°. *Because these Expressions are applied to the same person.* *Answ.* A very demonstrative Reason, is it not, that there-

there
press

38

prebe

Jesus

to p

word

of t

ded

Jesus,

thou

very

new

Learn

of Le

son of

with

himse

safely

out th

Have

nothin

p. 91.

that if

we mu

differ

words

fication

Bishop

Therefore they cannot be different Expressions of the same thing?

3°. *And because they are both comprehended in one general Name, viz.*

Jesus. *Answ.* It requires some Skill to put so many Falshoods in so few words. For neither both nor either

these Expressions are comprehended in the Name *Jesus*: And that

Jesus, the Name of a particular Person, could be a *general Name*, is a discovery reserv'd to be found out by this

new Logician. However *general* is a learned Word, which when a Man

Learning has used twice, as a Reason of the same thing, he is cover'd

with *Generals*. He need not trouble himself any farther about sense, he may

freely talk what Stuff he pleases, without the least Suspicion of his Reader.

Having thus strongly proved just nothing; he proceeds and tells us,

91. *Yet it does not follow thence, but that if we will speak strictly and closely,*

we must be forced to confess, they are of different Significations. By which

words (if his words have any Signification) he plainly allows, that the

Bishop meant as he says, that these

two are but *different Expressions of the same thing* : But withal tells him, that if he will *speak closely and strictly*, he must say, *they are of different Significations*. My concernment in the case being only, that in the Passage alledg'd, the Reverend Author said, that the *Son of God* and the *Messiah* were *different Expressions of the same thing*, I have no more to demand after these words of the *Unmasker*, he has granted all I would have. But shall leave it to the decisive Authority of this Superlative Critick to determine, whether this Learned Bishop, or any one living, besides himself, can understand the Phrases of the New Testament, and *speak strictly and closely* concerning them. Perhaps his being yet alive, may preserve this Eminent Prelate from the malicious driveling of the *Unmasker's Pen*, which has bespotted the Ashes of two of the same Order, who were no mean Ornaments of the *English Church*; And if they had been now alive, no body will doubt, but the *Unmasker* would have treated them after another fashion.

But

But let me ask the *Unmasker*, whether (if either of these Pious Prelates, whose words I have above quoted, did understand that Phrase of the *Son of God* to stand for the *Messiah*, which they might do without holding any one *Socinian* tenet) he will dare to pronounce him a *Socinian*. This is so ridiculous an Inference, that I could not but laugh at it. But withal tell him, *Vindic.* p. 23. That “ if the sense
“ wherein I understand those Texts
“ be a Mistake, I shall be beholding
“ to him to set me right : But they
“ are not popular Authorities, or
“ frightful Names, whereby I judge
“ of Truth or Falshood”. To which I subjoin these words; “ You will now
“ no doubt applaud your Conje-
“ ctures, the Point is gain’d, and I
“ am openly a *Socinian*. Since I will
“ not disown, that I think the *Son of*
“ *God* was a Phrase, that among the
“ *Jews* in our Saviour’s time was used
“ for the *Messiah*, though the *Soci-*
“ *nians* understand it in the same
“ sense. And therefore I must cer-
“ tainly be of their Perswasion in
“ every thing else. I admire the ac-

“cuteness, force, and fairness of your
 “Reasoning, and so I leave you to
 “triumph in your Conjectures”. Nor
 has he failed my expectation: For
 here, *p. 91.* of his *Socinianism Unmask’d*,
 he upon this erects his Comb, and
 Crows most mightily. *We may*, says
 he, *from hence as well as other Rea-*
sons, pronounce him the same with those
Gentlemen (i. e. as he is pleased to
 call them *my good Patrons and Friends*
the Racovians) *which you may perceive*
he is very apprehensive of, and thinks,
that this will be reckon’d a good Evi-
dence of his being, what he denied
himself to be before. The Point is
 gain’d, saith he, and I am openly
 Socinian. *He never utter’d truer*
words in his life, and they are the
Confutation of all his Pretences to the
contrary. This Truth which unwarily
 dropt from his Pen, confirms what I
 have laid to his Charge. Now you
 have Sung your Song of Triumph,
 ’tis fit you should gain your Victory,
 by shewing,

XLIX.

How my understanding the Son of God to be a Phrase used amongst the Jews in our Saviour's time, to signifie the Messiah, proves me to be a Socinian.

Or if you think you have proved it already, I desire you to put your Proof into a Syllogism : For I confess my self so dull, as not to see any such Conclusion deducible from my understanding that Phrase as I do, even when you have proved that I am mistaken in it.

The places which in the New Testament shew that the *Son of God* stands for the *Messiah*, are so many, and so clear, that I imagine no body that ever consider'd and compar'd them together, could doubt of their meaning, unless he were an *Unmasker*. Several of them I have Collected and set down in my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, p. 25, 26, 27. 29. 34, 35, 36. 41. 50, 51. 53, 54. 60. 95. 101.

A Second Vindication of the

First, *John the Baptist*, Joh. I. 20. when the *Jews* sent to know who he was, confessed he himself was not the *Messiah*. But of *Jesus* he says, v. 34. after having several ways in the foregoing Verses declar'd him to be the *Messiah*; And I saw and bare record, that this is the SON OF GOD. And again, Chap. III. 26--36. he declaring *Jesus* to be, and himself not to be the *Messiah*, he does it in these Synonymous terms of the *Messiah* and the Son of God, as appears by comparing, v. 28. 35, 36.

Nathanael owns him to be the *Messiah*, in these words, Joh. I. 50. Thou art the SON OF GOD, Thou art the King of Israel: Which our Saviour in the next Verse calls *Believing*, a term, all through the History of our Saviour, used for owning *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*. And for confirming that Faith of his, that he was the *Messiah*, our Saviour further adds, that he should see greater things, i.e. Should see him do greater Miracles, to evidence that he was the *Messiah*.

Luke the 4th. 41. And Devils also came out of many crying, Thou art the *Messiah*

Messiah the Son of God, and he rebuking them suffered them not to speak. And so again, St. Mark tells us, Chap. III. 11, 12. *That unclean Spirits, when they saw him, fell down before him and cried, saying, Thou art the Son of God. And he strictly charged them, that they should not make him known.* In both these places, which relate to different times, and different occasions, the Devils declare *Jesus* to be *the Son of God*. 'Tis certain, whatever they meant by it, they used a Phrase of a known Signification in that Country. And what may we reasonably think they designed to make known to the People by it? Can we imagine these unclean Spirits were Promoters of the Gospel, and had a Mind to acknowledge and publish to the People the Deity of our Saviour, which the *Unmasker* would have to be the Signification of the *Son of God*? Who can entertain such a thought? No, they were no Friends to our Saviour: And therefore desir'd to spread a Belief of him, that he was the *Messiah*, that so he might by the envy of the Scribes and Pharisees, be disturb'd

in

in his Ministry, and be cut off before he had compleated it. And therefore we see our Saviour in both places forbids them to make him known; As he did his Disciples themselves, for the same Reason. For when *St. Peter*, *Mat. XVI. 16.* had own'd *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, in these words; *Thou art the Messiah the Son of the living God.* It follows, *v. 20.* *Then charged he his Disciples, that they should tell no man, that he was Jesus the Messiah.* Just as he had forbid the Devils to make him known, i. e. to be the *Messiah*. Besides, these words here of *St. Peter* can be taken in no other sence, but barely to signifie that *Jesus* was the *Messiah*, to make them a proper Answer to our Saviour's Question. His first Question here to his Disciples, *v. 13.* is, *Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am?* The Question is not, of what Original do you think the *Messiah* when he comes will be? For then this Question would have been as it is, *Mat. XXII. 42.* *What think you of the Messiah, whose Son is he?* If he had enquir'd about the common opinion concerning the Nature and Descent of
the

the *Messiah*. But his Question is concerning himself; *Whom* of all the extraordinary Persons known to the *Jews*, or mentioned in their Sacred Writings, the People thought him to be. That this was the meaning of his Question is evident, from the Answer the Apostles gave to it; And his further demand, v. 14, 15. *They said, some say thou art John the Baptist, some Elias, and others Jeremias, or one of the Prophets. He saith unto them, But W H O M say ye that I am?* The People take me, some for one of the Prophets, or Extraordinary Messengers from God, and some for another: But which of them do you take me to be? *Simon Peter answer'd and said, Thou art the Messiah the Son of the living God.* In all which Discourse, 'tis evident there was not the least Enquiry made by our Saviour concerning the Person, Nature, or Qualifications of the *Messiah*; but whether the People or his Apostles thought him, i. e. *Jesus of Nazareth* to be the *Messiah*. To which St. Peter gave him a direct and plain Answer in the foregoing words, declaring their Belief
of

of him to be the *Messiah*: Which is all, that with any manner of Congruity, could be made the sence of St. *Peter's* Answer. This alone of it self were enough to justifie my interpretation of St. *Peter's* words, without the Authority of St. *Mark* and St. *Luke*, both whose words confirm it. For St. *Mark* Chap. VIII. 29. renders it, *Thou art the Messiah*, and St. *Luke*, Chap. IX. 18. *The Messiah of God*. To the like Question, *Who art thou*, *John* the Baptist gives a like Answer, *Joh. I. 19. 20. I am not the Christ*. By which Answer, as well as by the following Verses, it is plain, nothing was understood to be meant by that Question, but, which of the extraordinary Persons promised to or expected by the *Jews*, art thou?

Joh. XI. 27. The Phrase of the *Son of God* is made use of by Saint *Martha*: And that it was used by her to signifie the *Messiah*, and nothing else is evident out of the Context. *Martha* tells our Saviour, that if he had been there before her Brother died, he by that Divine Power, which he had manifested in so many Miracles which he

he had done, could have saved his Life; and that now, if our Saviour would ask it of God, he might obtain the Restoration of his Life. *Jesus* tells her, he shall rise again: Which words *Martha* taking to mean, at the general Resurrection, at the last Day; *Jesus* thereupon takes occasion to intimate to her, that he was the *Messiah*, by telling her, that he was *the Resurrection and the Life*, i.e. That the Life, which Mankind should receive at the general Resurrection, was by and through him. This was a description of the *Messiah*. It being a received Opinion amongst the *Jews*, that when the *Messiah* came, the Just should rise, and live with him for ever. And having made this Declaration of himself to be the *Messiah*, he asks *Martha*, Believest thou this? What! Not whose Son the *Messiah* should be; But whether he himself was the *Messiah*; by whom Believers should have Eternal Life at the last Day. And to this, she gives this direct and apposite Answer; *Yea, Lord, I believe that thou art the Christ the Son of God, which should come into the World.*

The

The Question was only whether she was perswaded, that those, who believe in him, should be raised to eternal Life; That was in effect, whether he was the *Messiah*: And to this she answers *yea Lord*, I believe this of thee; And then she explains what was contain'd in that Faith of hers, even this, that he was the *Messiah*, that was promis'd to come, by whom alone Men were to receive eternal Life.

What the *Jews* also understood by the *Son of God* is also clear from that passage at the latter end of XXII. of *Luke*. They having taken our Saviour, and being very desirous to get a Confession from his own Mouth, that he was the *Messiah*, that they might from thence be able to raise a formal, and prevalent Accusation against him before *Pilate*; the only thing the Council asked him was, whether he was the *Messiah*, v. 67. To which he answers so in the following Words, that he lets them see, he understood, that the design of their Question was to entrap him, and not to believe in him, whatever he should declare

declare of himself: But yet he tells them, *Hereafter shall the Son of Man sit on the right hand of the power of God*; Words that to the *Jews* plainly enough owned him to be the *Messiah*: But yet such as could not have any force against him with *Pilate*. He having confessed so much, they hope to draw yet a clearer Confession from him. *Then said they all, art thou then the Son of God? And he said unto them, ye say that I am. And they said, what need we any further witness? For we ourselves have heard of his own Mouth.* Can any one think that the Doctrine of his *Deity* (which is that which the *Unmasker* accuses me for waveing) was that, which the *Jews* designed to accuse our Saviour of before *Pilate*; or that they needed Witnesses for? Common sense, as well as the current of the whole History shews the contrary. No, it was to accuse him, that he owned himself to be the *Messiah*, and thereby claim'd a Title to be King of the *Jews*. The *Son of God* was so known a Name amongst the *Jews* to stand for the *Messiah*; that having got that from his Mouth, they thought

thought they had Proof enough of Treason against him. This carries with it a clear and easie meaning. But if the *Son of God* be to be taken, as the *Unmasker* would have it, for a Declaration of his *Deity*, I desire him to make common, and coherent sence of it.

I shall add one Consideration more to shew, that the *Son of God* was a Form of Speech then used amongst the *Jews* to signifie the *Messiah*, from the persons that used it, viz. *John the Baptist*, *Nathanael*, *St. Peter*, *St. Martha*, the *Sanhedrim*, and the *Centurion*, Luke XXVII. 54. Here are *Jews*, *Heathens*; *Friends*, *Enemies*; *Men*, *Women*; *Believers*, and *Unbelievers*; All indifferently use this Phrase of the *Son of God*, and apply it to *Jesus*. The Question between the *Unmasker* and me is whether it was used by these several persons, as an Appellation of the *Messiah*, (or as the *Unmasker* would have it) in a quite different Sence; As such an Application of Divinity to our Saviour, that he that shall deny that to be the meaning of it in the minds of these Speakers, denies

denies the Divinity of *Jesus Christ*. For if they did speak it without that meaning, it is plain it was a Phrase known to have another meaning; or else they had talked unintelligible Jargon. Now I will ask the *Unmasker*, whether he thinks, that the *Eternal Generation*, or as the *Unmasker* calls it, *Filiation* of *Jesus* the Son of God, was a Doctrine that had enter'd into the Thoughts of all the Persons above-mentioned, even of the *Roman Centurion*, and the Soldiers that were with him watching *Jesus*? If he say he does, I suppose he thinks so only for this time, and for this occasion: And then it will lie upon him to give the World convincing Reasons for his Opinion, that they may think so too: Or if he does not think so, he must give up this Argument, and allow that this Phrase, in these places, does not necessarily import the Deity of our Saviour, and the Doctrine of his eternal Generation: And so a Man may take it to be an Expression standing for the *Messiah*, without being a *Son of God*, any more than he himself is one.

A a

There

A Second Vindication of the

There is one place, the Unmasker tells us, p. 87. that confutes all the Surmises about the Identity of these terms. It is, says he, that famous Confession of Faith, which the Æthiopian Eunuch made when Philip told him he might be baptized if he believed. This without doubt was said according to that apprehension which he had of Christ, from Philip's instructing him; for it is said, he Preached unto him Jesus, v. 35. He had acquainted him that Jesus was the Christ the anointed of God, and also that he was the Son of God, which includes in it that he was God. And accordingly this Noble Profelyte gives this account of his Faith, in order to his being Baptiz'd, in order to his being admitted a Member of Christ's Church, I believe that Jesus is the Son of God; Or you may read it according to the Greek, I believe the Son of God to be Jesus Christ. Where there are these two distinct Propositions.

1°. That Jesus is the Christ, the Messiah.

2°. That he is not only the Messiah, but the Son of God.

The

The *Unmasker* is every where steadily the same subtil Arguer. Whether he has proved, that *the Son of God*, in this Confession of the *Eunuch*, signifies, what he would have, we shall examine by and by. This at least is Demonstration, that this Passage of his overturns his Principles ; and reduces his long List of Fundamentals to two Propositions,* the belief whereof is sufficient to make a Man a Christian. *This Noble Profelyte*, says the *Unmasker*, gives this account of his Faith in order to his being baptized, in order to being admitted a Member of Christ's Church. And what is that Faith according to the *Unmasker* ? He tells you *there are in it these two distinct Propositions*, viz. I believe, 1°. *That Jesus is the Christ the Messias* ; 2°. *That he is not only the Messias, but the Son of God*. If this famous Confession, containing but these two Articles were enough to his being Baptized ; If this Faith were sufficient to make *this Noble Profelyte* a Christian ; what is become of all those other Articles of the *Unmasker's* System, without the belief whereof, he in other places tells us a Man cannot be a

Christian ? If he had here told us, that Philip *had not time nor opportunity*, during his short stay with the Eunuch, to explain to him all the *Unmasker's* System, and make him understand all his Fundamentals; he had had Reason on his side : And he might have urged it as a Reason why *Philip* taught him no more. But nevertheless he had, by allowing the *Eunuch's Confession of Faith* sufficient for his Admittance as a *Member of Christ's Church*, given up his other Fundamentals as necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian; even that of the *Holy Trinity* : And he has at last reduced his necessary Articles to these two, *viz.* That *Jesus is the Messiah*, and that *Jesus is the Son of God*. So that after his ridiculous calling mine a *lank Faith*, I desire him to consider, what he will now call his own. Mine is next to *none*, because, as he says, it is but *one* Article. If that reasoning be good, his is not far from *none* : It consists but in two Articles, which is next to *one*, and very little more remote from *none* than *one* is. If any one had but as much Wit as the *Unmasker*, and could be but as smart

smart upon the number *two*, as he has been upon an *unit*, here were a brave opportunity for him to lay out his Parts ; and he might make vehement Complaints against one, that has thus *cramp'd our Faith, corrupted mens Minds, depraved the Gospel, and abused Christianity*. But if it should fall out, as I think it will, that the *Unmasker's* two Articles should prove to be but *One*, he has saved another that labour, and he stands painted to himself with his own Charcoal.

The *Unmasker* would have the *Son of God*, in the Confession of the Eunuch, to signifie something different from the *Messiah*: And his reason is, because else it would be an *absurd Tautology*. *Answ.* There are many Exegetical Expressions put together in the Scripture, which though they signifie the same thing, yet are not *absurd Tautologies*. The *Unmasker* here inverts the Proposition, and would have it to signifie thus. *The Son of God is Jesus the Messiah*, which is a Proposition so different from what the Apostles proposed every where else, that he ought to have given a Reason, why,

when every where else they made the Proposition to be of some thing affirm'd of *Jesus* of *Nazareth*, the Eunuch should make the Affirmation to be of something concerning the Son of God : As if the Eunuch knew very well what the *Son of God* signified, viz. as the *Unmasker* tells us here, that it included or signified *God*; and that *Philip*, (who we read at *Samaria* preach'd *τὸν Χριστὸν* the *Messiah*, i. e. instructed them who the *Messiah* was) had here taken pains only to instruct him, that this God was *Jesus* the *Messiah*, and to bring him to assent to that Proposition. Whether this be Natural to conceive, I leave to the Reader.

The *Tautology*, on which the *Unmasker* builds his whole Objection, will be quite removed, if we take *Christ* here for a proper Name in which way it is used by the *Evangelists* and *Apostles* in other places, and particularly by *St. Luke*; as *Act. II. 28. III. 6. 20. IV. 10. XXIV. 24, &c.* In two of these places, it cannot with any good sence be taken otherwise; for if it be not in *Act. III. 6. and IV. 10.* used as a proper Name, we must read those places thus,

thus, *Jesus the Messiah of Nazareth* : And I think it is plain in those others cited, as well as in several other places of the New Testament, that the word *Christ* is used as a proper Name. We may easily conceive, that long before the *Acts* were writ the Name of *Christ*, was grown by a familiar use to denote the Person of our Saviour, as much as *Jesus*. This is so manifest, that it gave a Name to his Followers, who as *St. Luke* tells us, XI. 26. were were called *Christians* ; And that, if Chronologists mistake not, Twenty Years before *St. Luke* writ his History of the Apostles ; And this so generally, that *Agrippa a Jew* uses it, *Act. XXVI. 28.* And that *Christ* as the proper Name of our Saviour was got as far as *Rome*, before *St. Luke* writ the *Acts*, appears out of *Suetonius*, l. 5. And by that Name he is called in *Tacitus*, Ann. l. 15. 'Tis no wonder then, that *St. Luke* in Writing this History, should sometimes set it down alone, sometimes join'd with that of *Jesus*, as a proper Name ; which is much easier to conceive he did here, than that *Philip* propos'd more to the Eunuch to be

believed to make him a Christian, than what in other places was propos'd for the Conversion of others; or than what he himself propos'd at *Samaria*.

His 7th. Chapter is to prove, that I am a *Socinian*, because I omitted Christ's *Satisfaction*. That Matter having been answer'd, *p. 147.* where it came properly under consideration, I shall only observe here, that the great stress of his Argument lies as it did before; not upon my total omission of it out of my Book, but on this, that *I have no such thing in the place where the Advantages of Christ's coming are purposely treated of*; from whence he will have this to be an unavoidable Inference, *viz. That I was of Opinion, that Christ came not to satisfy for us.* The reason of my omission of it in that place, I told him was because my Book was chiefly designed for *Deists*; and therefore I mention'd only those Advantages, which all Christians must agree in; and in omitting of that, comply'd with the Apostle's Rule, *Rom. XIV.* To this he tells me flatly, that was not *the design* of my Book. Whether the *Unmasker* knows with what design I publish'd it better than

than I my self, must be left to the Reader to judge : For as for his Veracity in what he knows, or knows not, he has given so many Instances of it, that I may safely referr that to any body. One Instance more of it may be found in this very Chapter, where he says, *I pretend indeed, p. 5. that in another place of my Book, I mention Christ's restoring all Mankind from the state of Death, and restoring them to Life, and his laying down his Life for another, as our Saviour Professes he did. These few words this Vindicator hath picked up in his Book since he wrote it. This is all, through his whole Treatise, that he hath drop'd concerning that Advantage of Christ's Incarnation, i. e. Christ's Satisfaction. Answ. But that this is not all that I drop'd through my whole Treatise concerning that Advantage, may appear by those places above-mentioned, p. 157. where I say, that the design of Christ's coming was to be offered up ; and speak of the Work of Redemption ; which are Expressions taken to imply our Saviour's Satisfaction : But the Unmasker thinking I should have quoted them, if there had been*

been any more, besides those mention'd in my *Vindication*, upon that Presumption sticks not boldly to affirm, that there were no more; and so goes on with the Veracity of an *Unmasker*. If affirming would do it, nothing could be wanting in his Cause that might be for his Purpose. Whether he be as good at proving, this Consequence (amongst other Propositions which remain upon him to be proved) will try, *viz.*

L.

That if the Satisfaction of Christ be not mentioned in the place where the Advantages of Christ's coming are purposely treated of, then I am of Opinion, that Christ came not to satisfy for us.

which is all the Argument of his 7th. Chapter.

His last Chapter, as his first, begins with a Commendation of himself. Particularly, it boasts his freedom from *Bigotism, Dogmatizing, Censoriousness, and Uncharitableness*. I think he hath
drawn

drawn himself so well, with his own Pen, that I shall need referr the Reader only to what he himself has writ in this Controversie, for his Character.

In the next Paragraph, p. 104. he tells me *I laugh at Orthodoxy*. Answ. There is nothing that I think deserves a more serious Esteem than right Opinion (as the Word signifies) if taken up with the Sense of Love and Truth. But this way of becoming Orthodox has always Modesty accompanying it, and a fair Acknowledgment of Fallibility in our selves, as well as a Supposition of Error in others. On the other side, there is nothing more ridiculous than for any Man or Company of Men to assume the Title of Orthodoxy to their own set of Opinions, as if Infallibility were annexed to their Systems, and those were to be the standing Measure of Truth to all the World; from whence they erect to themselves a power to censure and condemn others for differing at all from the Tenets they have pitch'd upon. The Consideration of humane Frailty ought to check this Vanity :
But

But since it does not, but that with a sort of Allowance it shews it self in almost all religious Societies, the playing the trick round, sufficiently turns it into ridicule. For each Society having an equal right to a good Opinion of themselves, a Man by passing but a River or a Hill, loses that Orthodoxy in one Company which puffed him up with such Assurance and Insolence in another ; and is there, with equal Justice, himself expos'd to the like Censures of Error and Heresie, which he was so forward to lay on others at Home. When it shall appear that Infallibility is intailed upon one set of Men of any Denomination, or Truth confined to any Spot of Ground, the Name and Use of Orthodoxy as now it is in Fashion every where, will in that one place be reasonable. Till then, this ridiculous Cant will be a Foundation too weak to sustain that Usurpation that is raised upon it. 'Tis not that I do not think every one should be perswaded of the Truth of those Opinions he professes. 'Tis that I contend for : And 'tis that which I fear the great
Sticklers

Sticklers for Orthodoxy often fail in. For we see generally that Numbers of them exactly jump in a whole large Collection of Doctrines, consisting of Abundance of particulars; as if their Notions were by one common Stamp printed on their Minds, even to the least Lineament. This is very hard, if not impossible, to be conceived of those who take up their Opinions only from Conviction. But how fully soever I am perswaded of the Truth of what I hold, I am in common Justice to allow the same Sincerity to him that differs from me; And so we are upon equal Terms. This Perswasion of Truth on each side, invests neither of us with a right to censure or condemn the other. I have no more reason to treat him ill for differing from me, than he has to treat me ill for the same cause. Pity him I may; inform him fairly I ought; but contemn, malign, revile or any otherwise prejudice him for not thinking just as I do, that I ought not. My Orthodoxy gives me no more Authority over him, than his (for every one is Orthodox to himself) gives him over me.

me. When the Word Orthodoxy (which in effect signifies no more but the Opinions of my Party) is made use of as a pretence to domineer (as ordinarily it is) it is, and always will be ridiculous.

He saith I *hate even with a deadly hatred all Catechisms and Confessions, all Systems, and Models.* I do not remember, that I have once mentioned the Word *Catechism*, either in my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, or *Vindication*. But he knows *I hate them deadly*, and I know I do not. And as for *Systems* and *Models*, all that I say of them, in the Pages he quotes to prove my Hatred of them, is only this, *viz.* p. 8. of my *Vindication* “Some Men had
“rather you should write booty, and
“cross your own Design of removing
“Mens Prejudices to Christianity,
“than leave out one Title of what
“they put into their Systems”.
“Some Men will not bear it, that
“any one should speak of Religion,
“but according to the Model that
“they themselves have made of it”.
In neither of which places do I speak against *Systems* or *Models*; but
the

the ill use, that some Men make of them.

He tells me also in the same place, p. 104. that I *deride Mysteries*. But for this he hath quoted neither words, nor place: And where he does not do that, I have reason from the frequent Liberties he takes to impute to me, what no where appears in my Books, to desire the Reader to take what he says not to be true. For did he mean fairly, he might, by quoting my Words, put all such Matters of Fact out of doubt; and not force me so often as he does to demand where it is, as I do now here again,

LI.

Where it is that I deride Mysteries?

His next Words, p. 104. are very remarkable: They are *O how he [the Vindicator] grins at the Spirit of Creed making?* p. 18. *Vind. the very thoughts of which do so haunt him, so plague and torment him, that he cannot rest*

rest till it be conjured down. And here by the way, seeing I have mention'd his rancour against Systematick Books and Writings, I might represent the Misery that is coming upon all Booksellers if this Gentleman and his Correspondents go on successfully. Here is an effectual Plot to undermine Stationers-Hall; for all Systems and Bodies of Divinity, Philosophy, &c. must be cashier'd: Whatever looks like System must not be bought or sold. This will fall heavy on the Gentlemen of St. Paul's Church-yard, and other places. Here the Politick Unmasker seems to threaten me with the Possession of Paul's Church-yard, because my Book might lessen their Gain in the Sale of Theological Systems. I remember that Demetrius the Shrine-maker which brought no small gain to the Crafts-men whom he called together, with the Workmen of like Occupation, and said to this purpose; Sirs, Ye know, that by this Craft we have our Wealth; Moreover ye see, and hear, that this Paul hath perswaded, and turned away much People saying, that they be no Gods that are made with hands, so that this our Craft is in danger to be set at naught.

naught. And when they heard these Sayings, they were full of wrath, and cried out, saying, Great is Diana of the Ephesians. Have you, Sir, who are so good at Speech-making, as a worthy Successor of the Silver-smith, regulating your Zeal for the Truth, and your writing of Divinity by the Profit it will bring, made a Speech to this purpose to the Craftsmen, and told them, that I say, Articles of Faith, and Creeds, and Systems in Religion cannot be made by Mens Hands or Fancies; But must be just such, and no other, than what God hath given us in the Scriptures? And are they ready to cry out to your content, Great is Diana of the Ephesians? If you have well warm'd them with your Oratory, 'tis to be hoped they will heartily join with you, and bestir themselves, and choose you for their Champion, to prevent the Misery you tell them is coming upon them, in the loss of the Sale of Systems and Bodies of Divinity; For, as for Philosophy, which you name too, I think you went a little too far. Nothing of that kind, as I remember, hath been so

B b

much

much as mention'd. But however, some sort of Orators, when their hands are in, omit nothing true or false, that may move those that they would work upon. Is not this a worthy Employment, and becoming a Preacher of the Gospel, to be a Solicitor for *Stationers-Hall*? and make the Gain of the *Gentlemen of Paul's Church-yard* a Consideration, for or against any Book writ concerning Religion? This, if it were ever thought on before, nobody but an *Unmasker*, who lays all open, was ever so foolish as to Publish. But here you have an account of his Zeal: The views of Gain are to measure the truths of Divinity. Had his Zeal, as he pretends in the next Paragraph, no other aims, but the *defence of the Gospel*, 'tis probable this Controversie would have been managed after another fashion.

Whether what he says in the next, p. 105. to excuse his so often pretending to *know my Heart and Thoughts*, will satisfy the Reader, I shall not trouble my self. By his so often doing it again in his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, I see he cannot write without it. And so

so I leave it to the Judgment of the Readers, whether he can be allow'd to know other Mens thoughts, who in many Occasions seems not well to know his own. The Railing in the remainder of this Chapter I shall pass by, as I have done a great deal of the same strain in his Book: Only to shew how well he understands or represents my sense, I shall set down my Words, as they are in the Pages he quotes, and his Inferences from them.

Vindicat. p. 22.

I know not but it may be true, that the Antitrinitarians and *Racovians* understand those places as I do: But 'tis more than I know, that they do so. I took not my sense of those Texts from those Writers, but from the Scripture it self, giving Light
to

Socin. Unmask'd,
p. 108.

The professed Divines of England, you must know, are but a pitiful sort of Folks with this great Racovian Rabbi. He tells us plainly, that he is not mindful of what the generality of Divines declare for,
p. 22. *He labours so concernedly to ingratiate himself*
B b 2 with

to its own meaning by one place compared with another. What in this way appears to me its true meaning, I shall not decline; because I am told that it is so understood by the *Racovians*, whom I never yet read; nor embrace the contrary, though the generality of Divines I more converse with, should declare for it. If the sense wherein I understand those Texts be a Mistake, I shall be beholding to you, if you will set me right. But they are not popular Authorities, or frightful Names whereby I judge of Truth or Falshood.

He tells me here of the *Generality of Divines*. If he had said of the Church of *England*, I could have understood him. But he says, *The professed Divines of England*; And there being several sorts of Divines in *England*, who, I think, do not every where agree

agree in their Interpretations of Scripture; which of them is it I must have regard to, where they differ? If he cannot tell me that, he complains here of me for a Fault, which he himself knows not how to mend.

Vindicat. p. 18.

Socin. Unmask'd,

p. 109.

The list of Materials for his Creed, for the Articles are not yet formed, Mr. Edwards closes, p. 111. with these words, *These are the Matters of Faith contain'd in the Epistles, and*

This Author, as demure and grave as he would sometimes seem to be, can scoff at the matters of Faith contain'd in the Apostles Epistles, p. 18. l. 4, &c.

they are Essential and Integral parts of the Gospel it self. What just these? neither more nor less? l. 4. If you are sure of it, pray let us have them speedily, for the reconciling of Differences in the Christian Church, which has been so cruelly torn about the Articles of the Christian Faith, to the great Reproach of Christian Charity, and Scandal of our true Religion.

B b 3

Does

A Second Vindication of the

Does the Vindicator here scoff at the Matters of Faith contain'd in the Epistles? Or shew the vain Pretences of the Unmasker; who undertakes to give us out of the Epistles a Collection of Fundamentals, without being able to say whether those he sets down be all or no?

Vindicat. p. 33.

Socin. Unmask'd,
p. 110.

I hope you do not think how contemptibly forever you speak of the *Venerable Mob*, as you are pleas'd to dignifie them, p. 117. that the bulk of Mankind, or in your Phrase, the *Rabble* are not concerned in Religion, or ought not to understand it in order to their Salvation. I remember the Pharisees treated the Common People with Contempt, and said, *Have any of the Rulers or of the Pharisees believed in him? But this People who knoweth not the Law are cursed.* But yet these, who in the
censure

To Coakse the Mob, he prophane-ly brings in that place of Scripture. Have any of the Rulers believed in him?

censure of the *Pharisees* were cursed, were some of the *Poor*, or, if you please to have it so, the *Mob*, to whom the Gospel was Preach'd by our Saviour, as he tells *Johns Disciples*, *Mat. XI. 5.*

Where the *Prophaneness* of this is, I do not see; Unless some unknown Sacredness of the *Unmasker's* Person make it *Prophaneness* to shew, that he like the *Pharisees* of old, has a great contempt for the Common People, *i.e.* the far greater part of Mankind; as if they and their Salvation were below the regard of this elevated Rabbi. But this of *Prophaneness* may be well born from him, since in the next words my mentioning another part of his Carriage is no less than *Irreligion*.

Vindicat. p. 25.

He prefers what I say to him myself to what is offer'd to him from the Word of God,
and

Socin. Unmask'd,

p. 110.

Ridiculously and irreligiously he pretends, that I prefer what he saith to me, to what

B b 4 is

and makes me this is offer'd to me
Complement, that from the Word of
I begin to mend God, p. 25.

about the close, *i.e.*

when I leave off quoting of Scripture,
and the dull Work was done of *going*
through the History of the Evangelists
and the Acts, which he computes,
p. 105. to take up three Quarters of
my Book.

The Matter of Fact is as I relate
it, and so is beyond *pretence*, and for
this I refer the Reader to the 105. and
114. Pages of his *Thoughts concerning*
the Causes of Atheism. But had I mi-
staken, I know not how he could have
call'd it *Irreligiously*. Make the worst
of it that can be, how comes it to be
Irreligious? What is there Divine in an
Unmasker; that one cannot pretend
(true or false) that he prefers what I
say, to what is offer'd him from the
Word of God, without doing it *Irre-*
ligiously? Does the very assuming the
Power to define Articles, and deter-
mine who are, and who are not Chri-
stians, by a Creed not yet made,
erect an *Unmasker* presently into God's
Throne,

Throne, and bestow on him the title of *Dominus deusq; noster*, whereby Offences against him come to be Irreligious Acts? I have misrepresented his meaning; Let it be so: Where is the *Irreligion* of it? Thus it is: The Power of making a Religion for others (and those that make Creeds do that) being once got into any one's fancy, must at last make all Oppositions to those Creeds and Creed-maker's Irreligion. Thus we see in process of time it did in the Church of *Rome*: But it was in length of time, and by gentle degrees. The *Unmasker*, it seems, cannot stay, is in haste, and at one jump leaps into the Chair. He has given us yet but a piece of his Creed, and yet that is enough to set him above the state of Humane Mistakes or Frailties, and to mention any such thing in him, is to do *Irreligiously*.

We may further see, says the *Unmasker*, p. 110. how counterfeit the *Vindicator's Gravity* is, whilst he condemns frothy and light Discourses, p. 26. *Vindic.* And yet in many Pages together, most irreverently treats a great part of the *Apostolical Writings*, and throws aside
the

the main Articles of Religion as unnecessary. *Answ.* In my *Vindic.* p. 19. you may remember these words, “ I require you to Publish to the World those Passages which shew my contempt of the Epistles”. Why do you not (especially having been so called upon to do it) set down those words, wherein *I most irreverently treat a great part of the Apostolical Writings?* At least why do you not quote those *many Pages* wherein I do it? This looks a little suspiciously, that you cannot: And the more, because you have in this very Page not been sparing to quote places which you thought to your purpose. I must take leave therefore (if it may be done without *Irreligion*) to assure the Reader, that this is another of your many Mistakes in Matters of Fact, for which you have not so much as the excuse of Inadvertency: For as he sees, you have been minded of it before. But an *Unmasker*, say what you will to him, will be an *Unmasker* still,

He closes what he has to say to me in his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, as if he were in the Pulpit, with an Use of Exhor-

Exhortation. The false Insinuations, it is filled with, makes the Conclusion of a Piece with the *Introduction*. As he sets out so he ends, and therein shews wherein he places his Strength. A custom of making bold with Truth, is so seldom curable in a grown Man, and the *Unmasker* shews so little sence of Shame, where it is charged upon him, beyond a possibility of clearing himself, that no body is to trouble themselves any farther about that part of his established Character. Letting therefore that alone to Nature and Custom, two sure Guides, I shall only intreat him, to prevent his taking Railing for Argument, (which I fear he too often does) that upon his entrance every where upon any new Argument, he would set it down in Syllogism, and when he has done that (that I may know what is to be answered) let him then give Vent as he pleases, to his noble Vein of Wit and Oratory.

The lifting a Man's self up in his own Opinion, has had the Credit in former Ages to be thought the lowest Degradation that Humane Nature could

could well sink it self to. Hence says the Wise Man, *Prov. XXVI. 6. Answer a Fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit.* Hereby shewing, that Self-conceitedness is a Degree beneath ordinary Folly. And therefore he there provides a fence against it, to keep even Fools from sinking yet lower, by falling into it. Whether what was not so in *Solomon's* days, be now, by length of time, in ours, grown into a mark of Wisdom and Parts, and an Evidence of great Performances; I shall not enquire. Mr. *Edwards*--- who goes beyond all that ever I yet met with in the Commendation of his own, best knows why he so extols what he has done in this Controversie. For fear the Praises he has not been sparing of in his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, should not sufficiently trumpet out his Worth, or might be forgotten; He in a new Piece entituled, *The Socinian Creed*, proclaims again his mighty Deeds, and the Victory he has established to himself by them, in these words; *But he and his Friends (the One-Article-Men) seem to have made Satisfaction by their profound*
silence

silence lately, whereby they acknowledge to the World, that they have nothing to say in Reply to what I laid to their Charge, and fully proved against them, &c. Socinian Creed, p.128. This fresh Testimony of no ordinary Conceit, which Mr. *Edwards* hath of the Excellency and Strength of his Reasoning in his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, I leave with him and his Friends to be considered of at their leisure: And if they think I have mis-applied the term of *Conceitedness*, to so Wise, Understanding, and every way accomplished a Disputant (if we may believe himself) I will teach them a way how he, or any body else, may fully convince me of it. There remains on his Score marked in this Reply of mine, several Propositions to be proved by him. If he can but find Arguments to prove them that will bear the setting down in form, and will so publish them, I will allow my self to be mistaken. Nay, which is more, if he or any body in the 112. Pages of his *Socinianism Unmasked*, can find but Ten Arguments that will bear the test of Syllogism, the true Touchstone of right

right Arguing, I will grant that that Treatise deserves all those Commendations he has bestowed upon it; though it be made up more of his own Panegyrick, than a Confutation of me.

In his *Socinian Creed* (for a *Creed-maker* he will be; and whether he has been as lucky for the *Socinians* as for the *Orthodox*, I know not) p. 120. he begins with me, and that with the same conquering Hand and Skill which can never fail of Victory; if a Man has but Wit enough to know what Proposition he is able to Confute, and then make that his Adversary's tenet. But the Repetitions of his old Song concerning *one Article, the Epistles, &c.* which occur here again, I shall only set down, that none of these excellent things may be lost, whereby this Accute and Unanswerable Writer has so well deserved his own Commendations, viz. That I say *there is but one single Article of the Christian Truth necessary to be believed and assented to by us*, p. 121. That I *slight the Christian Principles, curtail the Articles of our Faith, and ravish Christianity it self*

self from him, p. 123. And that I *turn the Epistles of the Apostle into Waste Paper*, p. 127, &c.

These, and the like Slanders, I have already given an Answer to in my Reply to his former Book. Only one new one here I cannot pass over in Silence; because of the remarkable Prophaneness which seems to me to be in it, which, I think, deserves public notice. In my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, I have laid together those Passages of our Saviour's Life, which seemed to me most eminently to shew his Wisdom, in that Conduct of himself, with that Reserve and Caution which was necessary to preserve him, and carry him through the appointed time of his Ministry. Some have thought I had herein done considerable Service to the Christian Religion, by removing those Objections which some were apt to make from our Saviour's Carriage, not rightly understood. This *Creed-maker* tells me, p. 127. *That I make our Saviour a Coward*: A Word not to be applied to the Saviour of the World by a Pious or Discreet Christian upon any pretence, without

without great Necessity and sure Grounds. If he had set down my words, and quoted the Page (which was the least could have been done to excuse such a Phrase) we should then have seen which of us two this impious and irreligious Epithete given to the Holy *Jesus*, has for its Author. In the mean time, I leave it with him, to be accounted for by his Piety, to those, who by his Example shall be encouraged to entertain so vile a thought, or use so prophane an Expression of the *Captain of our Salvation*, who freely gave himself up to Death for us. ^

He also says in the same p. 127. *that I every where strike at Systems, the Design of which is to establish one of my own, or to foster Scepticism, by beating down all others.*

For clear Reason or good Sence, I do not think our *Creed-maker* ever had his fellow. In the immediate preceding words of the same Sentence, he charges me with a *great Antipathy against Systems*; and before he comes to the end of it, finds out my *Design* to be the *establishing one of my own*. So that this my *Antipathy against Systems*,
makes

makes me in love with one. My *Design*, he says, *is to establish a System of my own, or to foster Scepticism in beating down all others.* Let my Book, if he pleases, be my System of Christianity. Now is it in me any more *fostering Scepticism*, to say my System is true and others not, than it is in the *Creed-maker* to say so of all other Systems but his own? For, I hope, he does not allow any System of Christianity to be true, that differs from his any more than I do.

But I have spoke against all Systems. *Ans.* And always shall, so far as they are set up by particular Men or Parties, as the just Measure of every Man's Faith, wherein every thing that is contained, is required and imposed to be believed to make a Man a Christian: Such an Opinion and Use of Systems I shall always be against; till the *Creed-maker* shall tell me amongst the Variety of them which alone is to be received and rested in, in the absence of his Creed: which is not yet finished, and, I fear, will not as long as I live. That every Man should receive from others, or

make to himself such a System of Christianity as he found most conformable to the Word of God, according to the best of his understanding, is what I never spake against, but think it every one's Duty to Labour for, and to take all opportunities as long as he lives, by Studying the Scriptures every day, to perfect.

But this, I fear, will not go easily down with our Author; for then he cannot be a *Creed-maker* for others. A thing he shews himself very forward to, how able to perform it we shall see when his Creed is made. In the mean time, talking loudly and at Random about Fundamentals, without knowing what is so, may stand him in some stead.

This being all that is new, which I think my self concerned in, in this *Socinian Creed*, I pass on to his *Postscript*. In the first Page whereof, I find these words, *I found that the Manager of the Reasonableness of Christianity, had prevailed with a Gentleman to make a Sermon upon my Refutation of that Treatise, and the Vindication of it.* Such a piece of Impertinency

nency as this, might have been born from a fair Adversary. But the Sample Mr. *Edwards* has given of himself in his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, perswades me this ought to be bound up with what he says of me in his *Introduction* to that Book in these words: *Among others, they thought and made Choice of a Gentleman, who they knew would be extraordinary useful to them. And he it is probable was as forward to be made use of by them, and presently accepted of the Office that was assigned him; and more there to the same purpose. All which, I know to be utterly false.*

'Tis pity that one who relies so entirely upon it, should have no better an Invention. The *Socinians* set the Author of the *Reasonableness of Christianity, &c.* on Work to write that Book, by which Discovery, the World being (as Mr. *Edwards* says) *let into the project*, that Book is confounded, baffled, blown off, and by this Skilful Artifice there is an end of it. Mr. *Bold* preaches and publishes a Sermon without this irrefragable Gentleman's good Leave and Liking: What now must be done to discredit it and keep

it from being read? Why, Mr. Bold too, was let on Work by *the Manager of the Reasonableness of Christianity, &c.* In your whole Store-house of Stratagems, you that are so great a Conquerour, Have you but this one Way to destroy a Book which you set your Mightiness against, but to tell the World it was a Jobb of Journey-work for some body you do not like? Some other would have done better in this new Case, had your happy Invention been ready with it: For you are not so bashful or reserved, but that you may be allowed to be as great a Wit as he who professed himself ready at any time to say a good or a new thing if he could but think of it. But in good earnest, Sir, if one should ask you, do you think no Books contain Truth in them which were Undertaken by the *Procurator* of a Book-seller? I desire you to be a little tender in the Point, not knowing how far it may reach. Ay, but such Book-sellers live not at the *Lower End of Pater-Noster-Row*, but in *Paul's Church-Yard*, and are the Managers of other-guess Books, than *The Reasonableness of*
of

of Christianity. And therefore you very rightly subjoin, *Indeed it was a great Master-Piece of Procuration, and we can't but think that Man must speak truth, and defend it very Impartially and Substantially, who is thus brought on to undertake the Cause.* And so Mr. Bold's Sermon is found to have neither Truth nor Sence in it, because it was Printed by a Bookseller at the lower End of *Pater-Noster-Row*; for that, I dare say, is all you know of the Matter. But that is hint enough for a happy Diviner to be sure of the rest, and with Confidence to report that for certain Matter of Fact, which had never any being but in the forecasting Side of his Politick Brain.

But whatever were the Reason that moved Mr. B--- to Preach that Sermon, of which I know nothing; This I am sure, it shews only the Weakness and Malice (I will not say, and ill Breeding, for that concerns not one of Mr. Edward's Pitch) of any one who excepts against it, to take notice of any thing more than what the Author has Published. Therein alone consists the Errour, if there be any;

and that alone those meddle with, who write for the sake of Truth. But poor Cavillers have other Purposes, and therefore must use other Shifts, and make a busle about something besides the Argument to prejudice and beguile unwary Readers.

The only Exception the *Creed-maker* makes to Mr. *Bold's* Sermon, is the Contradiction he imputes to him, in saying, " That there is but
 " one Point or Article necessary to
 " be believed for the making a Man
 " a Christian: And that there are
 " many Points *besides this*, which Je-
 " sus Christ hath taught and revealed,
 " which every sincere Christian is in-
 " dispensibly obliged to endeavour to
 " understand: And. " That there
 " are particular Points and Articles,
 " which being known to be revealed
 " by Christ, Christians must indispen-
 " sibly assent to". And where now
 is there any thing like a Contradiction
 in this? Let it be granted for Ex-
 ample, that the *Creed-maker's* Set of
 Articles (let their Number be what
 they will when he has found them all
 out) are necessary to be believed, for
 the

the making a Man a Christian. Is there any contradiction in it to say, There are many Points besides these, which Jesus Christ hath taught and revealed, which every sincere Christian is indispensibly obliged to endeavour to understand? If this be not so; It is but for any one to be perfect in Mr. *Edward's* Creed, and then he may lay by the Bible, and from thenceforth he is absolutely dispensed with, from studying or understanding any thing more of the Scripture.

But Mr. *Edwards's* Supremacy, is not yet so far established that he will dare to say, That Christians are not obliged to endeavour to understand any other Points revealed in the Scripture, but what are contained in his Creed. He cannot yet well Discard all the rest of the Scripture; because he has yet need of it for the compleating of his Creed, which is like to secure the Bible to us for some time yet. For I will be answerable for it, he will not be quickly able to resolve what Texts of the Scripture do, and what do not contain Points necessary to be believed. So that I am apt to

imagine, that the *Creed-maker*, upon Second Thoughts, will allow that Saying, There is but One, or there are but Twelve, or there are but as many as he shall set down (when he has resolved which they shall be) necessary to the making a Man a Christian; and the saying, There are other Points besides contained in the Scripture, which every sincere Christian is indispensibly obliged to endeavour to understand, and must believe when he knows them to be revealed by Jesus Christ; are two Propositions that may consist together without a Contradiction.

Every Christian is to partake of that Bread and that Cup which is the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ. And is not every sincere Christian indispensibly obliged to endeavour to understand these Words of our Saviour's Institutions, *This is my Body*, and *This is my Blood*? And if upon his serious Endeavour to do it, he does understand them in a literal sense, that Christ meant that that was really his Body and Blood, and nothing else; must he not necessarily believe

believe that the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper, is changed really into his Body and Blood, though he doth not know how? Or, if having his Mind set otherwise, he understands the Bread and Wine to be really the Body and Blood of Christ; without ceasing to be true Bread and Wine; Or else, if he understands them, that the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed given and received in the Sacrament, in a Spiritual manner; Or lastly, If he understands our Saviour to mean by those words, only the Bread and Wine to be a Representation of his Body and Blood; In which way soever of these Four, a Christian understands these words of our Saviour to be meant by him, is he not obliged in that sense to believe them to be true, and assent to them? Or can he be a Christian, and understand these words to be meant by our Saviour, in one sense, and deny his assent to them as true, in that sense? Would not this be to deny our Saviour's Veracity, and consequently his being the *Messiah* sent from God? And yet this is put upon a Christian where
he

he understands the Scripture in one sense, and is required to believe it in another. From all which it is evident, that to say there is One, or any Number of Articles necessary to be known and believed to make a Man a Christian, and that there are others contained in the Scripture, which a Man is obliged to endeavour to understand, and obliged also to assent to as he does understand them, is no Contradiction.

To believe Jesus to be the Messiah, and to take him to be his Lord and King, let us suppose to be that only which is necessary to make a Man a Christian: May it not yet be necessary for him, being a Christian, to study the Doctrine and Law of this his Lord and King, and believe that all that he delivered is true? Is there any Contradiction in holding of this? But this *Creed-maker*, to make sure Work, and not to fail of a Contradiction in Mr. *Bold's* words, misrepeats them, p. 241. and quite contrary both to what they are in the Sermon, and what they are as set down by the *Creed-maker* himself, in the immediately

ately preceding Page; Mr. *Bold* says,
“ There are other Points that Jesus
“ Christ hath taught and revealed,
“ which every sincere Christian is in-
“ dispensibly *obliged to understand*, and
“ which being known to be revealed
“ by Christ, he must indispensibly
“ assent to”. From which, the *Creed-*
maker argues thus, p. 240. Now if there
be other Points and particular Articles,
and those many, which a sincere Christian
is obliged, and that necessarily and in-
dispensibly to understand, believe, and
assent to, then this Writer hath in effect
yielded to that Proposition I maintained,
viz. That the belief of one Article is not
sufficient to make a Man a Christian,
and consequently he runs counter to the
Proposition he had laid down.

Is there no difference, I beseech you,
between being *indispensibly obliged*
to endeavour to understand, and being
indispensibly obliged to understand
any Point? Tis the first of these,
Mr. *Bold* says, and 'tis the latter
of these you argue from, and so con-
clude nothing against him; nor can
you to your purpose. For till Mr. *Bold*
says (which he is far from saying)
that

that every sincere Christian is necessarily and indispensibly obliged to understand all those Texts of Scripture, from whence you shall have drawn your necessary Articles (when you have perfected your Creed) in the same sense that you do, you can conclude nothing against what he hath said concerning that one Article, or any thing that looks like *running Counter* to it. For it may be enough to constitute a Man a Christian, and one of Christ's Subjects, to take *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, his appointed King, and yet without a Contradiction, so that it may be his indispensable Duty as a Subject of that Kingdom, to endeavour to understand all the Dictates of his Sovereign, and to assent to the Truth of them, as far as he understands them.

But that which the good *Creed-maker* aims at, without which, all his necessary Articles fall, is that it should be granted him, that every sincere Christian was *necessarily and indispensibly obliged* to understand all those parts of Divine Revelation, from whence he pretends to draw his Articles

cles in their true meaning, *i.e.* just as he does. But his infallibility is not yet so established, but that there will need some proof of that Proposition. And when he has proved that every sincere Christian is *necessarily and indispensibly* obliged to understand those Texts in their true meaning, and that his Interpretation of them is that true meaning; I shall then ask him, whether *every sincere Christian is not as necessarily and indispensibly obliged* to understand other Texts of Scripture, in their true meaning, though they have no place in his System?

For Example, To make use of the Instance above-mentioned, is not every sincere Christian *necessarily and indispensibly* obliged to endeavour to understand these Words of our Saviour; *This is my body, and this is my blood*, that he may know what he receives in the Sacraments? Does he cease to be a Christian, who happens not to understand them just as the *Creed-maker* does? Or may not the old Gentleman at *Rome* (who has somewhat the ancients Title to Infallibility) make Transubstantiation a Funda-

Fundamental Article necessarily to be believed, there, as well as the *Creed-maker* here makes his Sence of any disputed Text of Scripture a Fundamental Article necessary to be believed?

Let us suppose Mr. *Bold* had said that instead of *one point*, the Right Knowledge of the *Creed-makers* One Hundred Points (when he has resolved on them) doth constitute and make a Person a Christian; yet there are many other Points Jesus Christ hath taught and revealed which every sincere Christian is indispensibly obliged to endeavour to understand, and to make a due use of: For this I think the *Creed maker* will not deny. From whence, in the *Creed-maker's* Words, I will thus argue. Now if there be other Points and particular Articles, and those many, which a sincere Christian is obliged, and that necessarily and indispensibly, to understand and believe, and assent to, then this Writer doth in effect yield to that Proposition which I maintained, viz. That the Belief of those one hundred Articles is not sufficient to make a Man a Christian. For this

this is that which I maintain; That upon this ground, the Belief of the Articles which he has set down in his List, are not sufficient to make a Man a Christian; and that upon Mr. *Bold's* Reason, which the *Creed-maker* insists on against one *Article*, viz. because there are many other Points Jesus Christ hath taught and revealed, which every sincere Christian is as necessarily and indispensibly obliged to endeavour to understand and make a due use of.

But this *Creed-maker* is cautious, beyond any of his Predecessors: He will not be so caught by his own Argument; and therefore is very shy to give you the precise Articles that every sincere Christian is necessarily and indispensibly obliged to understand, and give his assent to. Something he is sure there is that he is indispensibly obliged to understand and assent to, to make him a Christian; but what that is, he cannot yet tell. So that whether he be a Christian or no, he does not know, and what other People will think of him, from his treating of the serious things of Christianity, in so trifling

trifling and scandalous a way, must be left to them.

In the next Paragraph, *p. 242.* The Creed-maker *tells us*, *Mr. Bold goes on to confute himself, in saying*, “ a true Christian must assent unto this that Christ Jesus is God”. But this is just such another Confutation of himself as the before-mentioned, *i. e.* as much as a Falshood substituted by another Man, can be a confutation of a Man’s self, who has spoken Truth all of a piece. For the *Creed-maker*, according to his sure way of *baffling* his Opponents, so as to leave them nothing to answer, hath here, as he did before, changed *Mr. Bold’s* words, which in the 35.*p.* quoted by the *Creed-maker* stand thus; “ When a true Christian understands that Christ Jesus hath taught that *He is a God*, he must assent unto it”. Which is true and conformable to what he had said before; that every sincere Christian must endeavour to understand the Points taught and revealed by Jesus Christ, which being known to be revealed by him he must assent unto.

The

The like piece of Honesty the *Creed-maker* shews in the next Paragraph, p. 243. where he charges Mr. *Bold* with saying that a true Christian is as much obliged to believe that the Holy Spirit is God, as to believe that Jesus is the Christ, p. 40. In which place, Mr. *Bold's* words are; "When a true Christian understands that Christ Jesus hath given this Account of the Holy Spirit, viz. That he is God; He is as much obliged to believe it, as he is to believe that Jesus is the Christ". Which is an uncontestable Truth, but such an one as the *Creed-maker* himself saw would do him no Service, and therefore he mingles it, and leaves out half to make it serve his turn. But he that should give a Testimony in the slight Affairs of Men, and their Temporal Concerns, before a Court of Judicature, as the *Creed-maker* does here, and almost every where, in the great Affairs of Religion, and the Everlasting Concern of Souls, before all Mankind, would lose his Ears for it. What therefore this worthy Gentleman alledges out of Mr. *Bold*, as a Contradiction to him-

D d self,

self, being only the *Creed-maker's* Contradiction to Truth and clear Matter of Fact, needs no other Answer.

The rest of what he calls *Reflections on Mr. Bold's Sermon*, being nothing but either rude and mis-becoming Language of him; Or pitiful Childish Application to him, to change his Perswasion at the *Creed-maker's* Intreaty, and give up the Truth he hath owned, in Courtelie to this doubty Combatant, shews the Ability of the Man. Leave off begging the Question, and superciliously presuming that you are in the right, and instead of that, shew it by Argument; And I dare answer for *Mr. Bold*, you will have him, and I promise you with him one Convert more. But Arguing is not, it seems, this notable Disputant's way. If Boasting of himself, and contemning others, false Quotations, and feigned Matters of Fact, which the Reader neither can know, nor is the Question concerned in if he did know, will not do, there is an end of him; He has shewn his excellency in scurrilous Declamation; and there you have the whole of this unanswerable Writer. And for this

I appeal to his own Writings in this Controversie, if any judicious Reader can have the patience to look them over.

In the Beginning of his Reflections on Mr. Bold's Sermon, he confidently tells the World, That *he had found that the Manager of the Reasonableness of Christianity, had prevailed on Mr. Bold to Preach a Sermon upon his Reflections, &c.* And adds, *And we cannot but think, that that Man must speak the truth, and defend it very impartially and substantially, who is thus brought on to undertake the Cause.* And at the latter end, he Addresses himself to Mr. Bold, as one that is *drawn off to be an under Journey-man Worker in Socinianism.* In his gracious Allowance, *Mr. Bold is seemingly a Man of some relish of Religion and Piety, p. 244.* He is forced also to own him to be a *Man of Sobriety and Temper, p. 245.* A very good rise, to give him out to the World, in the very next words, as a Man of a profligate Conscience: For so he must be, who can be *drawn off to Preach or Write for Socinianism*, when he thinks it a most dangerous Errour,

who can *dissemble with himself*, and *choak his inward Perswasions* (as the *Creed-maker* insinuates that *Mr. Bold* does in the same Address to him, *p. 248.*) and write contrary to his Light. Had the *Creed maker* had reason to think in earnest that *Mr. Bold* was going off to *Socinianism*, he might have reasoned with him fairly, as with a Man running into dangerous Errour: Or if he had certainly known that he was by any By-ends prevailed on to undertake a Cause contrary to his Conscience, he might have some Reason to tell the World as he does, *p. 239.* *That we cannot think he should speak truth, who is thus brought to undertake the Cause.* If he does not certainly know that *Mr. Bold* was *THUS* brought to undertake the Cause, he could not have shewn a more Villainous and Unchristian Mind than in publishing such a Character of a Minister of the Gospel, and a worthy Man, upon no other Grounds, but because it might be subservient to his ends. He is engaged in a Controversie that by Argument he cannot maintain; Nor knew any other way from the beginning

ning, to attack the Book he pretends to write against ; but by crying out *Socinianism* ; a Name he knows in great Disgrace with all other Sects of Christians, and therefore sufficient to deter all those who approve, and condemn Books by hearsay, without examining their Truth themselves, from perusing a Treatise to which he could affix that imputation. Mr. *Bold*'s Name (who is publickly known to be no *Socinian*) he foresees will wipe off that false Imputation, with a great many of those who are led by Names more than Things. This seems exceedingly to trouble him, and he labours might and main, to get Mr. *Bold* to quit a Book as *Socinian*, which Mr. *Bold* knows is not *Socinian* ; because he has read and considered it.

But though our *Creed-maker* be mightily concerned that Mr. *B----* should not appear in the Defence of it : Yet this concern cannot raise him one jot above that Honesty, Skill and good Breeding, which appears towards others. He manages this Matter with Mr. *B----*, as he has done the rest of the Controversie, just in the same

A Second Vindication of the

strain of Invention, Civility, Wit and good Sence. He tells him, besides what I have above set down, *that he is drawn off to debase himself and the post, i.e. the Ministry, he is in, p. 245. That he hath said very ill things to the lessening and impairing, yea, to the defaming of that knowledge and belief of our Saviour, and of the Articles of Christianity, which are necessarily required of us, p. 245. That the Devout and Pious* (whereby he means himself, for *one* and *none* is his own beloved Wit and Argument) *observing that Mr. Bold is come to the necessity of but ONE Article of Faith, they expect that he may in time hold that NONE is necessary, p. 248. That if he writes again in the same strain, he will write rather like a Turkish Spy, than a Christian Preacher; That he is a Backslider, and Sailing to Racovia with a side Wind: Than which, what can there be more Scurrilous or more Malicious? And yet at the same time, that he outrages him thus, beyond not only what Christian Charity, but common Civility would allow in an ingenuous Adversary, he makes some awkward Attempts*

Attempts, to sooth him, with some ill timed Commendations. And would have his under-valuing Mr. *Bold's Animadversions*, pass for a Complement to him: Because he, for that reason, pretends not to believe *so crude and shallow a thing* (as he is pleased to call it) to be his. A notable Contrivance to gain the greater Liberty of Railing at him under another Name, when Mr. *B--d's* it seems is too well known to serve him so well to that purpose. Besides it is of good use to fill up three or four Pages of his *Reflections*: a great Convenience to a Writer, who knows all the ways of *baffling* his Opponents but Argument, and who always makes a great deal of stir about Matters foreign to his Subject, which whether they are granted or denied, make nothing at all to the Truth of the Question on either side. For what is it to the *Shallownefs* or Depth of the *Animadversions*, who writ them? Or to the Truth or Falseness of Mr. *B--d's* Defence of the *Reasonableness of Christianity* whether a *Lay-man* or a *Church-man*; a *Socinian*, or one of the *Church of England* and

D d

swer'd the *Creed-maker* as well as he? Yet this is urged as a matter of great weight. But yet in reality it amounts to no more but this, that a Man of any Denomination, who wishes well to the Peace of Christianity, and has observed the horrible Effects the Christian Religion has felt from the Impositions of Men in Matters of Faith, may have reason to defend a Book, wherein the Simplicity of the Gospel, and the Doctrine proposed by our Saviour and his Apostles, for the Conversion of Unbelievers, is made out, though there be not one Word of the distinguishing Tenents of his Sect in it. But that all those, who under any Name, are for imposing their own Orthodoxy, as necessary to be believed, and persecuting those who dissent from them, should be all against it, is not perhaps very strange.

One thing more I must observe of the *Creed-maker* on this Occasion: In his *Socinian Creed*, Ch. VI. The Author of the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, &c. And his Book, must be judged of by the Characters and Writings of those, who entertain or commend his
Notions.

Notions. *A professed Unitarian has defended it ; therefore he is a Socinian.* The Author of *A Letter to the Deists*, speaks well of it , Therefore he is a *Deist*. Another as an Abettor of the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, he mentions, *p. 125.* whose Letters I have never seen : And his Opinions too are, I suppose, set down there as belonging to me. Whatever is bad in the Tenets or Writings of these Men infects me. But the Mischief is, *Mr. Bold's* Orthodoxy will do me no good : But because he has defended my Book against *Mr. Edwards*, all my Faults are become his, and he has a mighty Load of Accusations laid upon him. Thus contrary Causes serve so good a Natured, so Charitable and Candid a Writer as the *Creed-maker*, to the same purpose of Censure and Railing. But I shall desire him to figure to himself the Loveliness of that Creature which turns every thing into Venom. What others are, or hold, who have expressed favourable thoughts of my Book, I think my self not concerned in. What Opinions others have published, make those in my Book neither true nor false ;

false; and he that for the sake of Truth would confute the Errors in it, should shew their Falshood and Weakness as they are there: But they who write for other Ends than Truth, are always busie with other Matters, and where they can do nothing by Reason and Argument, hope to prevail with some, by borrowed Prejudices and Party.

Taking therefore the *Animadversions*, as well as the *Sermon*, to be his whose Name they bear, I shall leave to Mr. B--d, himself to take what Notice he thinks fit of the little Sence as well as great Impudence of putting his Name in Print to what is not his; or taking it away from what he hath set it to; whether it belongs to his *Bookseller* or *Answerer*. Onely I cannot pass by the palpable falsifying of Mr. B--d's Words, in the beginning of his Epistle to the Reader, without mention. Mr. B--d's Words are,
 "Whereby I came to be furnished
 "with a truer and more just No-
 "tion of the main Design of that
 "TREATISE" and the Good
Creed-maker set them down thus, *The main*

main Design of MY OWN TREATISE OR SERMON: A sure way for such a Champion for Truth to secure to himself the Laurel or the Whetstone.

This irresistible Disputant (who silences all that come in his way, so that those that would cannot answer him) to make good the mighty Encomiums he has given himself, ought (one would think) to clear all as he goes, and leave nothing by the way unanswered, for fear he should fall into the Number of those poor *baffled* Wretches whom he with so much scorn reproaches, that they *would* answer if they could.

Mr. B--d begins his *Animadversions* with this Remark, that our *Creed-maker* had said, *That I give it over and over again in these formal Words, viz. That nothing is required to be believed by any Christian Man but this, That Jesus is the Messiah.* To which Mr. B--d replies, p. 4. in these Words, “ Though I have read over the *Reasonableness of Christianity, &c.* with some Attention, I have not observed those formal Words in any part
“ of

A Second Vindication of the

“ of that Book, nor any Words that
 “ are capable of that Construction;
 “ provided they be consider'd with
 “ the Relation they have to, and the
 “ manifest Dependance they have on
 “ what goes before, or follows after
 “ them.”

**But to this Mr. Edwards answers
 not.**

Whether it was because *he would not*, or because he *could not*, let the Reader judge. But this is down upon his Score already, and it is expected he should answer to it, or else confess that he *cannot*. And that there may be a fair Decision of this Dispute. I expect the same Usage from him, that he should set down any Proposition of his, I have not answer'd to, and call on me for an Answer, if *I can*. And if *I cannot*, I promise him to own it in Print.

The Creed-maker had said, *That it is most evident to any thinking and considerate Person, that I purposely omit the Epistolary Writings of the Apostles, because they are fraught with other Fundamental Doctrines, besides that which I mention.*

To

To this Mr. *B--d* answers, *p.* 5.
That if by “ *Fundamental Articles*,
“ Mr. *Edwards* means here, all the
“ Propositions delivered in the Epi-
“ stles, concerning just those particu-
“ lar Heads he [Mr. *Edwards*] had
“ there mentioned, it lies upon him
“ to prove, That Jesus Christ hath
“ made it necessary, that every Per-
“ son must have an explicit Know-
“ ledge and Belief of all those, before
“ he can be a Christian.

**But to this Mr. *Edwards* answers
not.**

And yet without an Answer to it,
all his Talk about *Fundamentals*, and
those which he pretended to set down
in that place, under the Name of
Fundamentals, will signifie nothing in
the present case; Wherein, by *Funda-*
mentals, were meant such Propositions
which every Person must necessarily
have an explicit Knowledge and Be-
lief of, before he can be a Christian.

Mr. *B--d*, in the same place, *p.* 6,
and 7. very truly and pertinently adds,
“ That it did not pertain to [my]
“ undertaking to enquire what Do-
“ctrines

“ Doctrines either in the *Epistles*, or
 “ the *Evangelists* and the *Acts*, were
 “ of greatest moment to be under-
 “ stood by them who are Christians,
 “ but what was necessary to be
 “ known and believed to a Person’s
 “ being a Christian. For there are
 “ many important Doctrines, both
 “ in the *Gospels* and in the *Acts*, be-
 “ sides this, *That Jesus is the Messiah*.
 “ But how many soever the Do-
 “ ctrines be, which are taught in the
 “ *Epistles*, if there be no Doctrine
 “ besides this, *That Jesus is the Mes-*
 “ *siah*, taught there as necessary to
 “ be believed to make a Man a Chri-
 “ stian, all the Doctrines taught
 “ there will not make any thing
 “ against what this Author has as-
 “ serted, nor against the Method he
 “ hath observed; Especially, consi-
 “ dering we have an Account in
 “ the *Acts of the Apostles*, of what
 “ those Persons by whom the *Epi-*
 “ *stles* were writ, did teach as ne-
 “ cessary to be believed to Peoples
 “ being Christians.

This, and what Mr. B---d subjoins,
 “ That it was not my design to give
 “ an

“ an Abstract of any of the inspired
“ Books”, is so true, and has so clear
Reason in it, that any but this Writer,
would have thought himself concerned to
have answered something to it.

But to this Mr. *Edwards* answers
not.

It not being it seems a *Creed-maker's*
Business to convince Mens Understanding
by Reason, but to impose on their Belief
by Authority, or where that is wanting,
by Fallshoods and Bauling. And to such
Mr. *Bold* observes well, *p. 8.* that “ if I
“ given the like Account of the
“ Epistles, that would have been as
“ little satisfactory as what I have
“ done already, to those who are re-
“ solved not to distinguish *BE-*
“ *TWIXT WHAT IS NE-*
“ *CESSARY TO BE BE-*
“ *LIEVED TO MAKE A*
“ *MAN A CHRISTIAN, AND*
“ *THOSE ARTICLES WHICH*
“ *ARE TO BE BELIEVED*
“ *BT THOSE WHO ARE*
“ *CHRISTIANS,* as they can
attain

“ attain to know, that Christ hath
 “ taught them.

This Distinction the *Creed-maker*, no where that I remember, takes any Notice of; unless it be *p. 255.* where he has something relating hereunto, which we shall consider when we come to that place. I shall now go on to shew what Mr. *Bold* has said, to what he answers not.

Mr. *Bold* farther tells him, *p. 10.* That if he will prove any thing in Opposition to the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, &c. it must be this;
 “ That Jesus Christ and his Apostles
 “ have taught, that the Belief of
 “ some one Article, or certain Num-
 “ ber of Articles distinct from this,
 “ *That Jesus is the Messiah*, either as
 “ exclusive of, or in Conjunction
 “ with the Belief of this Article, doth
 “ constitute and make a Person a
 “ Christian: But that the Belief of
 “ this, that Jesus is the Messiah alone,
 “ doth not make a Man a Christian”

But to this Mr. *Edwards* irrefragably answers nothing.

Mr.

Mr. *Bold* also, p. 10. Charges him with his falsly accusing me in these words: *He pretends to contend for one single Article, with the exclusion of all the rest, for this reason; because all Men ought to understand their Religion.* And again where he says I aim at this, viz. *That we must not have any Point of Doctrine in our Religion, that the Mob doth not at the very first naming of it, perfectly understand and agree to,* Mr. *Bold* has quoted my expresse words to the contrary.

But to this, this answerable Gentleman answers nothing.

But if he be such a mighty Disputant, that nothing can stand in his way; I shall expect his direct Answer to it, among those other Propositions which I have set down to his Score, and I require him to prove if he can.

The *Creed-maker* spends Five Pages of his Reflections in a great stir who is the Author of those *Animadversions* he is *Reflecting* on. To which, I tell him, it matters not to a Lover of Truth, or a Confuter of Errours, who was the Author; but what they contain.

tain. He, who makes such a deal of doe about that which is nothing to the Question, shews he has but little Mind to the Argument; that his hopes are more in the recommendation of Names and prejudice of Parties, than in the Strength of his Reasons and the goodness of his Cause. A Lover of Truth follows That, whoever be for or against it; and can suffer himself to pass by no Argument of his Adversary, without taking notice of it either in allowing its force, or giving it a fair Answer. Were the *Creed-maker* capable of giving such an Evidence as this, of his Love of Truth, he would not have passed over the Twenty first Pages of Mr. *Bold's Animadversions* in silence. The Falshoods that are therein charged upon him would have required an Answer of him, if he *could* have given any: And I tell him he must give an Answer, or confess the Falshoods.

In his 255. *p.* he comes to take notice of these words of Mr. *Bold*, in the 21. Page of his *Animadversions*, viz.
“ That a Convert to Christianity or
“ a Christian, must necessarily be-
lieve

“ believe as many Articles as he shall
 “ attain to know that Christ Jesus
 “ hath taught”. Which, says the
 Creed-maker, *wholly invalidates what*
he had said before in these words, viz.
 “ That Jesus Christ, and his Apostles,
 “ did not teach any thing as necessary
 “ to be believed to make a Man a
 “ Christian, but only this one Pro-
 “ position. That Jesus of Nazareth
 “ was the Messiah”. The reason he
 gives to shew, That the former of
 these Propositions, (in Mr. Bold) *invali-*
dates the latter, and that the Animad-
verter contradicts himself, stands thus:
For, says he, if a Christian must give
assent to all the Articles taught by our
Saviour in the Gospel, and that necessa-
rily; then all those Propositions reckon’d
up in my late Discourse, being taught
by Christ or his Apostles, are necessary
to be believed. Answ. And what, I
beseech you, becomes of the rest of
the Propositions taught by Christ or his
Apostles, which you have not reckon’d
up in your late Discourse; Are not
they necessary to be believed, if a Chri-
stian must give an assent to ALL the
Articles taught by our Saviour and his
Apostles?

Sir, If you will argue right from that antecedent, it must stand thus : *If a Christian must give an assent to ALL the Articles taught by our Saviour and his Apostles, and that necessarily ;* Then all the Propositions in the New Testament, taught by Christ or his Apostles, are necessarily to be believed. This Consequence I grant to be true, and necessarily to follow from that antecedent, and pray make your best of it : But withal remember, that it puts an utter end to your select Number of Fundamentals, and makes all the Truths delivered in the New Testament necessary to be explicitly believed by every Christian.

But Sir, I must take notice to you, that if it be uncertain whether he that Writ the *Animadversions*, be the same Person that Preached the *Sermon*, yet it is very visible that 'tis the very same Person that reflects on both ; Because he here again uses the same Trick in answering in the *Animadversions*, the same thing that had been said in the *Sermon*, viz. By pretending to argue from words as
Mr.

Mr. *Bold's*, when Mr. *Bold* has said no such thing. The Proposition you argue from here is this, *If a Christian must give assent to all the Articles taught by our Saviour, and that necessarily.* But Mr. *Bold* says no such thing. His words, as set down by your self are; "A Christian must necessarily believe as many Articles as he shall attain to know that Christ Jesus hath taught". And is there no difference between *ALL* that Christ Jesus hath taught; and *AS MANY* as any one shall attain to know that Christ Jesus hath taught? There is so great a difference between these two, that one can scarce think even such a *Creed-maker* could mistake it. For one of them admits all those to be Christians, who taking Jesus for the *Messiah*, their Lord and King, sincerely apply themselves to understand and obey his Doctrine and Law, and do believe all that they understand to be taught by him: The other shuts out, if not all Mankind, yet Nine Hundred Ninety Nine of a Thousand, of those who profess themselves Christians, from being really so. For he speaks within Compass, who

E e 3

says

says there is not one of a Thousand, if there be any one Man at all, who explicitly knows and believes that all that our Saviour and his Apostles taught, *i.e.* All that is delivered in the New Testament, in the true sence that it is there intended. For if giving assent to it, in any sence, will serve the turn, our *Creed-maker* can have no Exceptions against *Socinians*, *Papists*, *Lutherans*, or any other, who acknowledging the Scripture to be the Word of God, do yet oppose his System.

But the *Creed-maker* goes on, *p.255.* and endeavours to prove, that what is necessary to be believed by every Christian, is necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, in these words : *But he will say, the belief of those Propositions, makes not a Man a Christian. Then, I say, they are not necessary and indispensable; for what is absolutely necessary in Christianity, is absolutely requisite to make a Man a Christian.*

Ignorance, or something worse, makes our *Creed-maker* always speak doubtfully or obscurely, whenever he pretends

pretends to argue; for here *absolutely necessary in Christianity* either signifies nothing, but absolutely necessary to make a Man a Christian; and then it is proving the same Proposition by the same Proposition: Or else, has a very obscure and doubtful Signification. For, if I ask him whether it *be absolutely necessary in Christianity* to obey every one of our Saviour's Commands, what will he answer me? If he answers, *NO*; I ask him which of our Saviour's Commands is it not *in Christianity absolutely necessary* to obey? If he answers, *YES*; Then I tell him by his rule, there are no Christians; because there is no one that does in all things obey all our Saviour's Commands, and therein fails to perform what is *absolutely necessary in Christianity*; and so by his rule is no Christian. If he answers, Sincere Endeavour to obey, is all that is *absolutely necessary*; I reply, And so Sincere Endeavour to understand, is all that is *absolutely necessary*: Neither perfect Obedience, nor perfect Understanding is *absolutely necessary in Christianity*.

But his Proposition being put in terms clear, and not loose and fallacious, should stand thus, *viz. What is absolutely necessary to every Christian, is absolutely requisite to make a Man a Christian* : But then I deny that he can infer from Mr. *Bold's* words, that those Propositions (*i. e.* which he has set down as Fundamental or necessary to be believed) are *absolutely necessary* to be believed by every Christian. For that indispensable necessity Mr. *Bold* speaks of, is not absolute, but conditional. His words are, *A Christian must believe as many Articles as he shall attain to know that Jesus Christ hath taught.* So that he places the indispensable necessity of Believing, upon the condition of attaining to know that Christ taught so. An endeavour to know what *Jesus Christ* taught, Mr. *B---d* says truly is *absolutely necessary* to every one who is a Christian, and to believe what he has attained to know that *Jesus Christ* taught, that also, he says, is *absolutely necessary* to every Christian. But all this granted (as true it is) it still remains (and eternally

eternally will remain) to be proved from this (which is all that Mr. *Bold* says) that something else is absolutely required to make a Man a Christian, besides the unfeigned taking *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, his King and Lord, and accordingly, a sincere resolution to obey and believe all that he commanded and taught.

The Jailor, *Acts XVI. 30.* in Answer to his Question, what he should *do to be saved*; was answer'd, That *he should believe in the Lord Jesus Christ*. And the Text says that the Jailor took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes, and was baptized, he and all his straight-way. Now, I will ask our Creed-maker, whether St. Paul in speaking to him the Word of the Lord, proposed and explained to him all those Propositions and Fundamental Heads of Doctrine, which our Creed-maker has set down as necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian. Let it be consider'd, the Jailor was a Heathen, and one that seems to have no more Sense of Religion or Humanity, than those of
that

that Calling use to have : For he had let them alone under the Pain of their Stripes without any Remedy, or so much as the ease of washing them, from the Day before, till after his Conversion, which was not till after Midnight. And can any one think that between his asking what he should *do to be saved*, and his being *baptized*, which the Text says, was *the same hour and straightway*, there was time enough for *St. Paul* and *Silas* to explain to him all the *Creed-maker's* Articles, and make such a Man as that, and all his house understand the *Creed-maker's* whole System ; especially since we hear nothing of it in the Conversion of these or any others who were brought into the Faith in the whole History of the Preaching of our Saviour and the Apostles ? Now let me ask our *Creed-maker*, whether the Jailor was not a Christian, when he was baptized ; and whether if he had then immediately died, he had not been saved, without the Belief of any one Article more than what *Paul* and *Silas* had then taught him ? Whence it follows, that
what

what was then proposed to him to be believed (which appears to be nothing but that *Jesus* was the *Messiah*) was all that was absolutely necessary to be believed to make him a Christian; though this hinders not but that afterwards it might be necessary for him, indispensibly necessary, to believe other Articles, when he attained to the Knowledge that Christ had taught them. And the reason of it is plain: Because the knowing that Christ taught any thing, and the not receiving it for true, (which is believing it) is inconsistent with the believing him to be the *Messiah*, sent from God to enlighten and save the World. Every word of Divine Revelation, is absolutely and indispensibly necessary to be believed, by every Christian, as soon as he comes to know it to be taught by our Saviour or his Apostles, or to be of Divine Revelation. But yet this is far enough from making it absolutely necessary to every Christian to know every Text in the Scripture, much less to understand every Text in the Scripture; and least of all, to understand

A Second Vindication of the

stand it as the *Creed-maker* is pleased to put his sence upon it.

This the good *Creed-maker* either will not, or cannot understand : But gives us a List of Articles culled out of the Scripture by his own Authority, and tells us those are absolutely necessary to be believed by every one, to make him a Christian. For what is of *absolute Necessity in Christianity*, as those he says are, he tells us is absolutely requisite to *make a Man a Christian*. But when he is asked whether these are all the Articles of absolute Necessity, to be believed to make a Man a Christian ; This worthy Divine, that takes upon him to be a Successor of the Apostles, cannot tell. And yet, having taken upon him also to be a *Creed-maker*, he must suffer himself to be called upon for it again and again, till he tells us what is of absolute Necessity to be believed to make a Man a Christian, or confess that he cannot.

In the mean time, I take the liberty to say, That every Proposition delivered in the New Testament by our Saviour, or his Apostles, and so received

ceived by any Christian as of Divine Revelation, is of as absolute necessity to be assented to by him, in the Sence he understands it to be taught by them, as any one of those Propositions enumerated by the *Creed-maker*: And if he thinks otherwise, I shall desire him to prove it. The Reason whereof is this, that in divine Revelation the ground of Faith being onely the Authority of the Proposer, where that is the same, there is no difference in the Obligation or Measure of believing. Whatever the *Messiah* that came from God taught, is equally to be believed by every one who receives him as the *Messiah*, as soon as he understands what it was he taught. There is no such thing as garbling his Doctrine, and making one part of it more necessary to be believed than another, when it is understood. His saying is, and must be, of unquestionable Authority to all that receive him as their heavenly King; and carries with it an equal Obligation of assent to all that he says as true. But since no Body can explicitly assent to any Proposition of our Saviour's

Saviour's as true, but in the Sence he understands our Saviour to have spoken it in, the same Authority of the *Messiah*, his King, obliges every one absolutely and indispensibly to believe every part of the New Testament in that Sence he understands it: For else he rejects the Authority of the Deliverer, if he refuses his Assent to it in that Sence which he is persuaded it was delivered in. But the taking him for the *Messiah*, his King and Lord, laying upon every one who is his Subject, an Obligation to endeavour to know his Will in all things, every true Christian is under an absolute and indispensable necessity, by being his Subject, to study the Scriptures with an unprejudiced mind, according to that Measure of Time, Opportunity, and Helps which he has; that in these sacred Writings, he may find what his Lord and Master hath by himself, or by the Mouths of his Apostles, required of him, either to be believed or done.

The *Creed-maker*, in the following Page, 256. hath these Words; *It is worth the Reader's observing, That notwithstanding*

withstanding I had in twelve Pages together, (viz. from the Eighth to the Twentieth) proved that several Propositions are necessary to be believed by us, in order to our being Christians; yet this Sham-Animadverter attends not to any one of the particulars which I had mentioned, nor offers any thing against them, but onely in a Lumping way, dooms them all in those magisterial Words; I, do not see any Proof he produces, p. 21. This is his wonderful way of confuting me, by pretending that he cannot see any Proof in what I alledge; and all the World must be led by his eyes.

Ans^r. It is worth the Reader's observing, That the Creed-maker does not reply to what Mr. Bold has said to him, as we have already seen, and shall see more as we go on; and therefore he has little reason to complain of him, for not having answered enough. Mr. Bold did well to leave that which was an insignificant lump, so as it was together: For 'tis no wonderful thing not to see any Proof, where there is no Proof. There is indeed, in those Pages the Creed-maker

ker mentions, much Confidence, much Assertion, a great many Questions asked, and a great deal said after his Fashion: But for a Proof, I deny there is any one: And if what I have said in another place already, does not convince him of it, I challenge him, with all his *Eyes* and those of the *World* to boot, to find out in those Twelve renowned Pages one Proof. Let him set down the Proposition, and his Proof of its being absolutely and indispensibly necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian; And I too, will join with him in his Testimonial of himself, that he is *irrefragable*. But I must tell him before-hand, talking a great deal loosely will not do it.

Mr. *Bold* and I say we cannot see any Proof in those Twelve Pages: The way to make us *see*, or to convince the World that we are blind, is to single out one Proof out of that Wood of Words there, which you seem to take for Arguments, and set it down in a Syllogism, which is the fair trial of a Proof or no Proof. You have indeed a Syllogism in the 23^d Page,

Page, but that is not in those Twelve Pages you mention. Besides, I have shew'd in another place, what that proves; to which I refer you.

In Answer to the *Creed-maker's* Question, about his other Fundamentals found in the Epistles; *Why did the Apostles Write these Doctrines?* Was it not, that those they Writ to, might give their Assent to them? Mr. Bold, p. 22. replies; "But then it may be asked again, Were not those Persons Christians, to whom the Apostles writ *these Doctrines*, and whom they required to Assent to them? Yes, verily: And if so, What was it that made them Christians, before their Assent to *these Doctrines* was required? If it were any thing besides their Believing *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, it ought to be instanced in, and made out."

But to this Mr. Edwards Answers not.

The next thing in Controversie between Mr. Bold and the *Creed maker*, (for I follow Mr. B—d's Order,) is about a Matter of Fact, viz. Whether the *Creed-maker* has proved,

F f

— That

A Second Vindication of the

" That *Jesus Christ* and his Apostles
 " have taught, That no Man can be
 " a Christian, or shall be saved, un-
 " less he have an explicit Knowledge of
 " all those things which have an imme-
 " diate respect to the Occasion, Author,
 " Way, Means and Issue of our Salva-
 " tion, and which are necessary for the
 " knowing the true Nature and Design
 " of it ?" This, Mr. Bold, p. 24.
 tells him " he has not done." To
 this the Creed-maker replies, p. 258.

And yet the Reader may satisfie him-
 self, that this is the very thing that
 I had been proving just before, and in-
 deed, all along in the foregoing Chapter.
 Answ. There have been those who
 have been seven Years proving a thing,
 which at last they could not do ;
 And I give you seven Years to prove
 this Proposition which you should
 there have proved, and I must add
 to your score here, viz.

LII.

That Jesus Christ, or his Apostles,
have taught, That no Man can be
a Christian, or can be saved, un-
less he hath an explicit Knowledge
of

of all those things which have an immediate respect to the Occasion, Author, Way, Means and Issue of our Salvation, and which are necessary for our knowing the true Nature and Design of it.

Nor must the poor Excuse, of saying, It was not necessary to add any farther Medium; and then proceed to another Syllogism, because you had secured that Proposition before; go for Payment. If you had secured it, as you say, it had been quite as easie, and much more for your Credit, to have produced the Proof whereby you had secured it, than to say you had done it; and thereupon to reproach Mr. Bold with *Heedlessness*; and to tell the World, that *he cares not what he saith*. The Rule of fair Dispute, is indispensibly to Prove, where any thing is Denied. To evade this, is Shuffling; and he that, instead of it, answers with ill Language, in my Country, is call'd a *Foul-mouth'd Wrangler*.

To the Creed-maker's Exception to my Demand, about the *Actual* Belief of all his *Fundamentals* in his new *Creed*; Mr. Bold asks, p. 24. " Whe-

“ther a Man can believe particular
 “ Propositions, and not *actually* be-
 “ lieve them ?”

But to this Mr. Edwards An-
 swers not.

Mr. *Bald*, p. 25. farther acknow-
 ledges the *Creed-maker's* Fundamental
 Propositions to “ be in the Bible ;
 “ and that they are for this purpose
 “ there, that they may be believed ;”
 “ And so, he saith, “ is every other
 “ Proposition which is taught in our
 “ Bibles :” But asks, “ How will it
 “ thence follow, that no Man can
 “ be a Christian, till he particularly
 “ know, and actually assent to every
 “ Proposition in our Bibles ?”

But to this Mr. Edwards An-
 swers not.

From p. 26, to 30. Mr. *Bald* shews,
 that the *Creed-makers* Reply, con-
 cerning my not gathering of Funda-
 mentals out of the Epistles, is nothing
 to the purpose, and this he demon-
 stratively proves.

And to this Mr. Edwards An-
 swers not.

The

The Creed-maker had falsely said,
 That I bring no Tidings of an Evan-
 gelical Faith: And thence very rea-
 dily and charitably inferrs; Which
 gives us to understand, that he verily
 believes there is no such Christian Faith.
 To this Mr. Bold thus softly replies,
 p. 31. "I think Mr. Edwards is much
 "mistaken, both in his Assertion and
 "Inference." And to shew that he
 could not so infer, adds; "If the
 "Author of the Reasonableness of Chri-
 "stianity, &c. had not brought any
 "Tidings of such a Faith, I think it
 "could not be thence justly infer'd,
 "that he verily believes there is no
 "such Christian Faith. Because his
 "Enquiry and Search was not con-
 "cerning Christian Faith, considered
 "subjectively, but objectively; What
 "the Articles be which must be be-
 "lieved, to make a Man a Christian;
 "and not, with what sort of Faith
 "these Articles are to be believed."

To this the Creed-maker answers,
 indeed; But it is something as much
 worse than nothing, as Falshood is
 worse than Silence. His words are,
 p. 258. It may be questioned, from what he

[the Animadverter] *bath the confidence to say, p. 31. viz. There is no Enquiry in the Reasonableness of Christianity, concerning Faith subjectively considered, but only objectively, &c.* And thus having set down Mr. B---d's Words otherwise than they are; for Mr. Bold does not say *there is no Enquiry*, i. e. no Mention, (for so the Creed-maker explains *Enquiries* here. For to convince Mr. Bold, that there is an *Enquiry*, i. e. Mention of *Subjective Faith*, he alledges, That *Subjective Faith* is *spoken of* in the 191. and 192. pages of my Book.) But Mr. Bold says, not that Faith considered subjectively, is *not spoken of* any where in the *Reasonableness of Christianity, &c.* But "That the Author's *Enquiry* and " *Search*, (i. e. the Author's Search, " or Design of his Search) was not " concerning Christian Faith confi- " dered subjectively: And thus the Creed-maker imposing on his Reader, by perverting Mr. Bold's Sence, from what was the Intention of my *Enquiry and Search*, to what I had said in it, he goes on, after his scurrilous fashion, to insult, in these words which follow;

low ; *I say, it may be guessed from this, what a Liberty this Writer takes, to assert what he pleases.* Answ. *To assert what one pleases, without Truth, and without Certainty, is the worst Character can be given a Writer : And with Falshood to charge it on another, is no mean Slander and Injury to a Man's Neighbour. And yet to these shameful Arts must he be driven, who finding his strength of managing a Cause, to lie only in Fiction and Falshood, has no other but the dull Billingsgate way of covering it, by endeavouring to divert the Reader's Observation and Censure from himself, by a confident repeated Imputation of that to his Adversary, which he himself is so frequent in the Commission of.* And of this, the Instances I have given, are a sufficient Proof : In which I have been at the Pains to set down the Words on both Sides, and the Pages where they are to be found, for the Reader's full Satisfaction.

The Cause in Debate between us is of great Weight, and concerns every Christian. That any Evidence

in the Proposal, or Defence of it, can be sufficient to conquer all Men's Prejudices, is a Vanity to imagine. But this, I think, I may justly demand of every Reader, that since there are great and visible Falshoods on one side or the other, (for the Accusations of this kind are positive and frequent,) he would examine on which Side they are. And upon that, I will venture the Cause in any Reader's Judgment, who will be but at the pains of turning to the Pages marked out to him. And as for him that will not do that, I care not much what he says.

The Creed-maker's following words, p. 258. have the Natural Mark of their Author. They are these. *How can this Animadverter come off with peremptory declaring, that Subjective Faith is not enquired into in the Treatise of the Reasonableness of Christianity, &c. When in another place, p. 35, and 36, he avers, That Christian Faith, and Christianity, consider'd Subjectively are the same.* Answer. In which words, there are two manifest Untruths; The one is, That Mr. Bold
perempto-

peremptorily declares, that Subjective Faith is not inquired into, i. e. Spoken of in the Reasonableness of Christianity, &c. Whereas Mr. Bold says in that place, p. 31. "If he [i. e. the Author] had not said one word concerning Faith subjectively considered". The Creed-maker's other Untruth, is his saying, That the Animadverter avers, p. 35. & 36. that Christian Faith and Christianity considered subjectively are the same. Whereas 'tis evident, that Mr. Bold arguing against these words of the Creed-maker, (*The belief of Jesus being the Messiah was one of the first and leading Acts of Christian Faith*) speaks in that place of an act of Faith, as these words of his demonstrate. "Now, I apprehend that Christian Faith and Christianity consider'd subjectively (and an ACT of Christian Faith, I think, cannot be understood in any other sense) are the very same". I must therefore desire him to set down the words, wherein the Animadverter peremptorily declares,

LIII.

That Subjective Faith is not enquired into, or spoken of, in the Treatise of the Reasonableness of Christianity, &c.

And next to produce the words wherein the *Animadverter* avers,

LIV.

That Christian Faith and Christianity consider'd subjectively, are the same.

To the Creed maker's saying, *That the Author of the Reasonableness of Christianity, &c. brings us no tidings of Evangelical Faith belonging to Christianity,* Mr. Bold replies; That I have done it in all those Pages where I speak of taking and accepting Jesus to be our King and Ruler, and particularly he sets down my words out of p. 301.

But to this Mr. Edwards Answers not.

The Creed-maker says, p. 59. of his *Seigniorism Unmasked*, that the Author of the *Reasonableness of Christianity*,
tells

tells men again and again, that a Christian Man, or Member of Christ, needs not know or believe any more than that one individual Point. To which Mr. Bold thus replies, p. 33. " If any Man will shew me those words in any part of the *Reasonableness*, &c. " I shall suspect I was not awake all the time I was reading that Book: And I am as certain as one awake can be, that there are several Passages in that Book directly contrary to these words. And there are some Expressions in the *Vindication of the Reasonableness*, &c. one would think, if Mr. Edwards had observed them, they would have prevented that Mistake.

But to this Mr. Edwards answers not.

Mr. Bold, p. 34. takes notice, that the Creed-maker had not put the Query or Objection right, which, he says, some, and not without some shew of ground, may be apt to start: And therefore Mr. Bold puts the Query right, viz. " Why did Jesus Christ and his Apostles, require assent to, and belief of
" this

A Second Vindication of the

“ this one Article alone, viz. That
 “ Jesus is the Messiah, to constitute
 “ and make a Man a Christian, or
 “ true Member of Christ (as it is a-
 “ bundantly evident they did, from
 “ the Reasonableness of Christianity) if
 “ the belief of more Articles is abso-
 “ lutely necessary to make and consti-
 “ tute a Man a Christian.

But to this Mr. Edwards answers
 not.

And therefore I put the Objection
 or Query to him again, in Mr. Bold's
 words, and expect an Answer to it, viz.

LV.

Why did Jesus Christ and his Apostles
 require assent to, and belief of this
 one Article alone, viz. That Jesus
 is the Messiah, to make a Man a
 Christian (as it is abundantly evi-
 dent they did from all their Preach-
 ing recorded throughout the whole
 History of the Evangelists and Acts)
 if the belief of more Articles be
 absolutely necessary to make a Man
 a Christian?

The

The Creed-maker having made believing *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, only one of the first and leading Acts of *Christian Faith*; Mr. Bold, p. 35. rightly tells him, That "Christian Faith must
 "be the belief of something or other:
 "And if it be the belief of any thing
 "besides this, That *Jesus is the Christ*
 "or *Messias*, that other thing should
 "be specified; and it should be made
 "appear, that the Belief that *Jesus*
 "is the *Messiah*, without the Belief of
 "that other Proposition, is not *Christian Faith*.

But to this Mr. Edwards answers not.

Mr. B---d, in the four following Pages; 36, 37, 38, 39. has excellently explained the difference between that Faith which constitutes a Man a Christian, and that Faith whereby one that is a Christian, believes the Doctrines taught by our Saviour; and the ground of that difference, and therein has fully over-turned this Position, that believing *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, is but a Step, or the first Step to Christianity.

But

But to this Mr. Edwards Answers not.

To the *Creed-makers* supposing that other Matters of Faith were proposed with this, That *Jesus* is the *Messiah*; Mr. *Bold* replies, That this should be proved, viz. That other Articles were proposed, as requisite to be believed to make Men Christians. And p. 40. he gives a Reason why he is of another Mind, viz. "Because there is nothing but this recorded, which was insisted on for that purpose."

But to this Mr. Edwards Answers not.

Mr. *Bold*, p. 42. shews, that *Rom. X. 9.* which the *Creed-maker* brought against it, confirms the Assertion of the Author of the *Reasonableness*, &c. concerning the Faith that makes a Man a Christian.

But to this Mr. Edwards Answers not.

The *Creed-maker* says, p. 78. *This is the main Answer to the Objection, (or Query above proposed,) viz. That Christianity was erected by degrees.* This, Mr. *Bold*, p. 43. proves to be nothing

nothing to the purpose, by this Reason; *viz.* "Because what makes one
"Man a Christian, or ever did make
"any Man a Christian, will at any
"time, to the End of the World,
"make another Man a Christian;"
And asks, "Will not that make a
"Christian now, which made the
"Apostles themselves Christians?"

**But to this Mr. Edwards answers
not.**

In Answer to his 6th. Chapter,
Mr. *Bold*, p. 45. tells him, "It was
"not my Business to discourse of the
"Trinity, or any other particular
"Doctrines proposed to be believed by
"them who are Christians; And that
"it is no fair and just Ground to ac-
"cuse a Man, for rejecting the Do-
"ctrines of the Trinity, and that
"Jesus is God; Because he does not
"interpret some particular Texts to
"the same purpose others do."

**But to this Mr. Edwards answers
not.**

Indeed he takes notice of these words
of Mr. *Bold*, in this Paragraph, *viz.*
"Hence Mr. *Edwards* takes occasion to
"write

“ write many Pages about these terms
“ [viz. *Messiah and Son of God*] But I
“ do not perceive that he pretends to
“ offer any Proof that these were not
“ Synonymous terms amongst the Jews
“ at that time, which is the Point he
“ should have proved, if he designed
“ to invalidate what this Author saith
“ about that matter.” To this the *Creed-*
maker replies, p. 257. *The Animadver-*
ter doth not so much as offer one syllable
to disprove what I delivered, and closely
urged on that head. Answer, What
need any Answer to disprove where
there is no Proof brought that reaches
the Proposition in Question? If there
had been any such Proof, the produ-
cing of it, in short, had been a more
convincing Argument to the Reader,
than so much bragging of what has
been done. For here are more Words
spent (for I have not set them all
down) than would have served to
have expressed the Proof of this Propo-
sition, viz. That the terms above-men-
tioned were not Synonymous amongst
the Jews, if there had been any Proof
of it. But having already examined
what the *Creed-maker* brags he has
closely

closely urged, I shall say no more of it here.

To the *Creed-makers* making me a Socinian, in his Eighth Chapter, for not naming Christ's Satisfaction amongst the Advantages and Benefits of Christ's coming into the World; Mr. *Bald* replies, 1. That it is no Proof, because "I promised not to name every one of them. And the mention of some is no denial of others." 2. He replies, That "Satisfaction is not so strictly to be termed an Advantage, as the effects and fruits of it are; and that the Doctrine of Satisfaction instructs us in the way how Christ did by divine Appointment, obtain those Advantages for us." And this was an Answer that deserved some reply from the *Creed-maker*.

But to this he answers not.

Mr. *Bald* says right, That this is a Doctrine that is of mighty Importance for a Christian to be well acquainted with. And I will add to it, that it is very hard for a Christian who reads the Scripture with Attention, and an

unprejudiced Mind, to deny the *Satisfaction* of *Christ* : But it being a term not used by the Holy Ghost in the Scripture, and very variously explained by those that do use it, and very much stumbled at by those I was there speaking to, who were such as I there say, “ who will not take a Blessing, “ unless they be instructed what need “ they had of it, and why it was bestowed upon them ; ” I left it, with the other disputed Doctrines of Christianity, to be looked into (to see what it was Christ had taught concerning it) by those who were Christians, and believed Jesus to be the Saviour promised and sent from God. And to those who yet doubted that he was so, and made this Objection ; “ What need was “ there of a Saviour ? ” I thought it most reasonable to offer such Particulars only as were agreed on by all Christians, and were capable of no Dispute, but must be acknowledged by every body to be needful. This, though the Words above-quoted out of p. 254, & 256. of the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, &c. shew to be my Design ; yet the *Creed maker* plainly gives me the
 Lye,

Lye, and tells me it was not my *Design*. All the World are *faithless, false, treacherous, hypocritical, Strainers upon their Reason and Conscience, Dissemblers, Journey-men, mercenary Hirelings*, except Mr. *Edwards*: I mean, all the World that opposes him. And must not one think he is mightily beholding to the Excellency and Readiness of his own Nature, who is no sooner engaged in Controversie, but he immediately finds out in his Adversaries these Arts of Equivocation, Lying and Effrontry in managing of it? Reason and Learning, and acquired Improvements, might else have let him have gone on with others in the dull and ordinary way of fair arguing; wherein possibly he might have done no great feats. Must not a rich and fertile Soyle within, and a prompt Genius wherein a Man may readily spie the Propensities of base and corrupt Nature, be acknowledged to be an excellent Qualification for a Disputant, to help him to the quick Discovery and laying open of the Faults of his Opponents; which a Mind otherwise disposed

G g 2

would

would not so much as suspect? Mr. *Bold* without this, could not have been so soon found out to be a *Journey-man*, a *Dissembler*, an *hired Mercenary*, and stored with all those good Qualities wherein he hath his full share with me. But why would he then venture upon Mr. *Edwards*, who is so very quick-sighted in these matters, and knows so well what villainous Man is capable of?

I should not here, in this my *Vindication*, have given the Reader so much of Mr. *Bold's* Reasoning, which though clear and strong, yet has more Beauty and Force as it stands in the whole Piece in his Book; Nor should I have so often repeated this Remark upon each Passage, *viz. to this Mr. Edwards answers not*; had it not been the shortest and properest Comment could be made on that triumphant Paragraph of his, which begins in the 128. page of his *Socinian Creed*, wherein amongst a great deal of no small strutting are these Words; *By their profound silence they acknowledge they have nothing to reply.* He that desires to see more of the

the same noble strain, may have recourse to that eminent Place. Besides, it was fit the Reader should have this one taste more of the *Creed-maker's* Genius, who passing by in silence all these clear and apposite Replies of Mr. *Bold*, loudly complains of him, p. 259. *That where he [Mr. Bold] finds something that he dares not object against, he shifts it off.* And again, p. 260. *That he doth not make any offer at Reason, there is not the least shadow of an Argument.---* As if he were only hired to say something against me [the *Creed-maker*] though not at all to the purpose: And truly, any Man may discern a **Mercenary** Stroke all along; with a great deal more to the same purpose. For such Language as this, mixed with Scurrility, neither fit to be spoken by, nor of a Minister of the Gospel, make up the remainder of his *Postscript*. But to prevent this for the future; I demand of him, That if in either of his Treatises there be any thing against what I have said, in my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, which he thinks not fully answer'd, he will set

down the Proposition in direct Words, and note the Page of his Book where it is to be found ; And I promise him an Answer to it. For as for his Railing, and other Stuff, besides the Matter, I shall hereafter no more trouble my self to take notice of it. And so much for Mr. *Edwards*.

THere is another Gentleman, and, of another sort of Make, Parts, and Breeding, who (as it seems, ashamed of Mr. *Edwards's* Way of handling Controversies in Religion) has had something to say of my *Reasonableness of Christianity*, &c. And so has made it necessary for me to say a Word to him, before I let these Papers go out of my Hand. It is the Author of *The Occasional Paper*, Numb. 1. The 2, 3, and 4 Pages of that *Paper*, gave me great hopes to meet with a Man who would examine all the Mistakes which come abroad in Print, with that Temper and Indifferency, that might set an exact Pattern for Controversie, to those who would approve themselves to be sincere Contenders for Truth and Knowledge,

ledge, and nothing else, in the Disputes they engaged in. Making him Allowance for the Mistakes that Self-Indulgence is apt to impose upon Humane Frailty, I am apt to believe he thought his Performances had been such: But I crave leave to observe, That good and candid Men are often misled, from a fair unbiassed pursuit of Truth, by an over-great Zeal for something that they, upon wrong Grounds, take to be so; And that it is not so easie to be a fair and unprejudiced Champion for Truth, as some who profess it think it to be. To acquaint him with the Occasion of this Remark, I must desire him to read and consider his 19th. Page, and then to tell me,

1. Whether he knows, that the *Doctrine* proposed in the *Reasonableness of Christianity, &c.* was *borrowed*, as he says, from *Hobbs's Leviathan*? For I tell him, I borrowed it only from the Writers of the Four *Gospels*, and the *Acts*; and did not know that those words he quoted out of the *Leviathan*, were there, or any thing like them. Nor do I know yet any farther,

ther, than as I believe them to be there, from his Quotation.

2. Whether affirming, as he does positively, this, which he could not know to be true, and is in it self perfectly false, were meant to encrease or lessen the Credit of the Author of the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, &c. in the Opinion of the World? Or is consonant with his own Rule, p. 3. of putting candid Constructions on what Adversaries say? Or with what follows, in these words; *The more Divine the Cause is, still the greater should be the Caution. The very Discoursing about Almighty God, or our Holy Religion, should compose our Passions, and inspire us with Candour and Love. It is very indecent to handle such Subjects in a manner that betrays Rancour and Spite. These are Fiends that ought to vanish; and should never mix either with a Search after Truth, or the Defence of Religion.*

3. Whether the Propositions which he has out of my Book, inserted into his 19th. Page, and says. *are consonant to the words of the Leviathan,* were those, of all my Book, which were

were likeliest to give the Reader a true and fair Notion of the Doctrine contained in it? If they were not, I must desire him to remember and beware of his *Fiends*. Not but that he will find those Propositions there to be true. But that neither he nor others may mistake my Book, this is that, in short, which it says,

1. That there is a Faith that makes Men Christians.

2. That this Faith is the Believing *Jesus of Nazareth* to be the *Messiah*.

3. That the Believing *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, includes in it a receiving Him for our Lord and King, promised and sent from God: And so lays upon all his Subjects an absolute and indissoluble necessity of assenting to all that they can attain, the Knowledge that he taught; and of a sincere Obedience to all that he commanded.

This, whether it be the Doctrine of the *Leviathan*, I know not. This appears to me out of the New Testament, from whence (as I told him in the *Preface*) I took it, to be the Doctrine of our Saviour and his Apostles; And I would not willingly be mistaken in

in it. If therefore there be any other Faith besides this absolutely requisite to make a Man a Christian, I shall here again desire this Gentleman to inform me what it is, *i. e.* to set down all those Propositions which are so indispensibly to be believed, (for 'tis of simple Believing, I perceive, the Controversie runs) that no Man can be a *Believer*, *i. e.* a Christian, without an Actual Knowledge of, and an Explicit Assent to them. If he shall do this with that Candour and Fairness he declares to be necessary in such Matters, I shall own my self obliged to him: For I am in earnest, and I would not be mistaken in it.

If he shall decline it, I, and the World too, must conclude, that upon a review of my Doctrine, he is convinced of the Truth of it, and is satisfied that I am in the right. For it is impossible to think that a Man of that Fairness and Candour which he solemnly Prefaces his Discourse with, should continue to condemn the Account I have given of the Faith which I am persuaded makes a Christian; And yet he himself will not tell me (when I earnestly

earnestly demand it of him, as desirous to be rid of my Error, if it be one). what is that more, which is absolutely required to be believed by every one, before he can be a Believer; *i. e.* what is indispensibly necessary to be known, and explicitly believed to make a Man a Christian.

Another thing which I must desire this Author to examine by those his own Rules, is, What he says of me, *p.* 30. where he makes me to have a Prejudice against the Ministry of the Gospel, and their Office, from what I have said, *p.* 260, 261, 270. of my *Reasonableness, &c.* concerning the *Priests* of the World, in our Saviour's time; which he calls *bitter Reflections*.

If he will tell me what is so *bitter*, in any of those Passages which he has set down, that is not true, or ought not to be said there, and give me the Reason why he is offended at it; I promise him to make what Reparation he shall think fit, to the Memory of those *Priests* whom he with so much Goodnature Patronizes, near Seventeen Hundred Years after they have been out of the World; and is so tenderly concerned

concerned for their Reputation, that he excepts against that, as said against them, which was not. For one of the three Places he sets down, was not spoken of Priests. But his making my mentioning the Faults of the Priests of old, in our Saviour's time, to be an *Exposing the Office of the Ministers of the Gospel* now, and a *Vilifying those who are employed in it*; I must desire him to examine, by his own Rules of Love and Candour, and to tell me, whether I have not reason here again to mind him of his *FIENDS*, and to advise him to beware of them? And to shew him why I think I have, I crave leave to ask him those Questions.

1. Whether I do not all along plainly, and in express words, speak of the Priests of the World, preceding, and in our Saviour's time? Nor can my Argument bear any other sence.

2. Whether all I have said of them be not true?

3. Whether the representing truly the Carriage of the *Jewish*, and more-especially of the *Heathen* Priests in our Saviour's time, as my Argument required,

required, can expose the Office of the Ministers of the Gospel now? or ought to have such an Interpretation put upon it?

4. Whether what he says of the *Ayr and Language I use reaching farther*, carry any thing else in it but a Declaration, that he thinks some Men's Carriage now, hath some affinity with what I have truly said of the Priests of the World before Christianity; and that therefore the Faults of those should have been let alone, or touch'd more gently, for fear some should think these now concerned in it?

5. Whether, in truth, this be not to accuse them with a Design to draw the Envy of it on me? Whether out of Good-will to them, or to me, or both, let him look. This I am sure, I have spoke of none but the Priests before Christianity, both *Jewish* and *Heathen*. And for those of the *Jews*, what our Saviour has pronounced of them, justifies my *Reflections* from being *bitter*; And that the Idolatrous Heathen Priests were better than they, I believe our Author will not say: And if he were Preaching against them, as
opposing

opposing the Ministers of the Gospel, I suppose he would give as ill a Character of them. But if any one extends my Words farther than to those they were spoke of, I ask whether that agrees with his Rules of *Love* and *Candour* ?

I shall impatiently expect from this Author of *The Occasional Paper*, an Answer to these Questions ; and hope to find them such as becomes that Temper, and Love of Truth, which he professes. I long to meet with the Man, who laying aside Party, and Interest, and Prejudice, appears in Controversie so as to make good the Character of a Champion of Truth for Truth's sake ; A Character not so hard to be known whom it belongs to, as to be deserved. Whoever is truly such an one, his Opposition to me will be an Obligation. For he that proposes to himself the convincing me of an Error, only for Truth's sake, cannot, I know, mix any *Rancour*, or *Spite*, or Ill-will, with it. He will keep himself at a distance from those *Fiends*, and be as ready to hear as offer Reason. And two so disposed, can hardly miss Truth between them,

in a fair Enquiry after it ; at least, they will not lose Good-breeding, and especially Charity, a Vertue much more necessary than the attaining of the Knowledge of obscure Truths, that are not easie to be found ; and probably, therefore, not necessary to be known.

The unbiaſſed Design of the Writer, purely to defend and propagate Truth, seems to me to be that alone which legitimates Controversies. I am sure, it plainly distinguishes such from all others, in their Success and Usefulness. If a Man, as a sincere Friend to the Person, and to the Truth, labours to bring another out of Error, there can be nothing more beautiful, nor more beneficial. If Party, Passion or Vanity direct his Pen, and have an Hand in the Controversie, there can be nothing more unbecoming, more prejudicial, nor more odious. What Thoughts I shall have of a Man that shall, as a Christian, go about to inform me what is necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, I have declared, in the *Preface* to my *Reasonableness of Christianity, &c.* nor
do

do I find my self yet alter'd. He that in Print finds fault with my imperfect Discovery of that wherein the Faith which makes a Man a Christian consists, and will not tell me what more is required, will do well to satisfie the World what they ought to think of him.

F I N I S.



5.T

2:

